St. Robert Bellarmine, S.J.

On the Relics and Images of Saints

Machine Translation

Sonnet 4 Translation

ON THE CHURCH TRIUMPHANT BOOK TWO

ON THE RELICS & IMAGES OF SAINTS

MACHINE TRANSLATION
CLAUDE SONNET 4

ON THE RELICS & IMAGES OF SAINTS

FROM CONTROVERSIARUM DE ECCLESIA TRIUMPHANTE. LIBER SECUNDUS. DE RELIQUIS ET IMAGINIBUS SANCTORUM

BY
CARDINALIS SANCTUS ROBERTUS BELLARMINUS, S.J.

DOCTOR CONTROVERSIARUM
THEOLOGIAE PROFESSOR IN COLLEGIO ROMANO

ORIGINAL LATIN TEXT PUBLISHED IN PARIS
BY LUDOVICUS VIVÈS, EDITOR
13 RUE DELAMBRE, 1870

TO THE BLESSED VIRGIN "THE DIVINE WORLD OF GOD WHERE LIE BEAUTIES AND TREASURES ONE CANNOT IMAGINE"

CONTENTS

Book Two

CH. 1	Against Relic Veneration	1
CH. 2	Refutation of Centuriators	5
CH. 3	The Truth Proven	12
CH. 4	Resolution of Objections	32
CH. 5	On "Image" and "Idol"	43
CH. 6	Leaders of Iconoclasm	49
CH. 7	Lawfulness of Images	56
CH. 8	On Divine Images	63
CH. 9	Images in Temples	75
CH. 10	Use of Images Beyond History	91
CH. 11	The Cult of Images Proposed	97
CH. 12	On Veneration of Christ and Saints	103
CH. 13	Resolution of Objections I	121
CH. 14	Resolution of Objections II	133
CH. 15	Resolution of Objections III	143
CH. 16	Resolution of Objections IV	149
CH. 17	Resolution of Objections V	152
CH. 18	Resolution of Objections VI	153

CONTENTS

CH. 19	Resolution of Objections VII	155
CH. 20	Worship Owed to Images	157
CH. 21	Images Worshipped Per Se	162
CH. 22	Latria Not Due to Images Per Se	165
CH. 23	Latria Due to Christ's Image Improperly	169
CH. 24	Worship Not Equal to the Exemplar	172
CH. 25	Mode of Worship for Images	180
CH. 26	On the Adoration of the Cross	182
CH. 27	On the True Cross	185
CH. 28	On the Image of the Cross	199
CH. 29	On the Sign of the Cross	208
CH. 30	Final Objections Resolved	215

PREFACE

We have arrived at length at that portion of the Catholic Church which requires illumination through our disputations and vindication from the falsehoods and calumnies—rather than the arguments—of heretics: namely, that part which enjoys blessedness in heaven with Christ its King throughout sempiternal ages. For although those blessed minds of holy Angels and men have no need of human defense or protection for themselves, being established in the highest and most secure citadels where they daily celebrate new triumphs over all their enemies, and (as Saint Cyprian declares) being entirely secure in their felicity and solicitous only for our salvation: nevertheless, it is most beneficial for us, and, to speak more truly, necessary in many respects, that the glory of the Saints should be known and manifest to the world, and should shine forth entirely purged and free from all the darkness of idolatry which heretics attempt to cast and pour upon it.

Since, however, we do not institute a panegyrical oration concerning the praises of the Saints, but merely open with this brief preface an entrance to future disputation, I shall speak only briefly concerning the falsehoods and reproaches of heretics

against the Saints—falsehoods which greatly impede the cure of the heretics' own madness, and reproaches which not only deprive the Church of distinguished patronage, but also bring upon all mortals the most grievous and just wrath of the Divine Majesty.

Indeed, there are many points on which the heretics of our time dissent from us; many things in our Church, temples, monasteries, schools, dogmas, rites, and finally in men of all orders they reprehend; many things they desire changed, many they criticize, many they clamor must be amended and corrected: but there is nothing which they abhor and execrate more than the invocation of Saints, the veneration of relics, and the worship of images. For in these three practices they claim manifest impiety and idolatry is contained. With this single cloak they believe they most honorably cover their dissension from us—that is, their impious separation and defection from the Catholic Church. Under this sole title they defend their robberies and sacrileges against churches, their plundering of temples, destruction of images, slaughter of priests, and profanation of all sacred things, claiming that they wage war against idols for the sake of piety. For this very cause they call the most equitable censure of the Church and the pastoral staffs of Bishops (by which their fury is sometimes restrained or delayed) an impious persecution, as if it were raised against God in favor of idols: finally, with these bonds and fetters they hold provinces and nations deceived by them most tightly ensnared and constrained.

For it has been persuaded to those peoples that we worship dead men in place of the living God; that in place of the supreme and eternal Spirit we venerate bones and ashes, wood and stones;

and this pernicious persuasion has penetrated their minds so deeply that we therefore labor under an unjust but nevertheless grave and lasting infamy among them. And although they sometimes hear much concerning the gravity, wisdom, justice, and benevolence of our people—that is, Catholic men—concerning their devotion to prayer and moderation in all things, they nevertheless cannot but immediately turn their ears away from such discourse and avert themselves entirely when they recall that those of whom such excellent praises are proclaimed are nonetheless idolaters who adore the spirits and corpses of the deceased, along with pictures and statues.

And that faith may be given to me more easily, and lest anyone suppose I am inventing something for the sake of exaggeration, I shall relate a few passages from their books, so that we may have them as heralds and witnesses of their own impiety. First, Luther, the standard-bearer and prince of all sectarians, in that sermon which he published on the cross, pronounces as if from a tribunal: "Since relics of Saints are nothing other than seductions of the faithful, lest the people henceforth worship alien gods, it pleases him that all such relics should be buried deepest under the earth"—so that by this means, evidently, all memory of the Apostles and Martyrs and other Saints on earth might be abolished. The same Luther, in his Postil on the Gospel of the Annunciation Sunday, says: "The Papists constitute the Virgin Mary as God, attributing to her omnipotence in heaven and on earth." And again: "In the Papacy all have turned to Mary and expected more favor and grace from her than from Christ himself."

Hence Philip Melanchthon, Luther's offspring and distinguished follower, when expounding the first precept of the Decalogue in his Common Places and distinguishing certain degrees of sins, was content with this single reason for joining us (that is, as he speaks, the Papists) with infidels: that it is the same thing to feign many gods and to invoke dead saints, and that the invocation of Saints and worship of statues differ not from pagan customs.

Now the Magdeburg Centuriators, after placing in the latter book of the first Century among the foundations of Catholic doctrine the invocation and worship of Blessed Mary and other Saints as not only never approved by the Apostles in word or example, but even everywhere reproved and forbidden as manifest idolatry, thenceforth in nearly every individual Century nothing do they more frequently admonish, cry out, repeat, and inculcate than that we have no Church, having defected from the one true God to a multitude of false gods and mute simulacra. In the preface of the sixth Century, where they most gravely and plainly tragically deplore the state—or rather the fall and ruin—of the Church, which they claim began to be corrupted in the second and third centuries, declined and tottered in the fourth and fifth, and finally in the sixth was entirely corrupted and miserably collapsed, they preach thus concerning the cause of such grave extermination:

"Primarily," they say, "those horrible and pernicious shadows arose in the very assembly of teachers, like certain black clouds occupying the entire heaven, because ceremonies and human forms of worship were increased everywhere in temples, partly by the Doctors of the Church themselves, partly by other superstitious

men. For sacred buildings began to be constructed in all places at enormous expense, entirely in the manner of the Gentiles—not indeed principally for the purpose that the word of God might be delivered there, but that some honor might be exhibited to relics of Saints, and that stupid men might venerate the deceased there. How eloquent indeed is that Gregory called 'the Great,' how ardent, when he dictates the method of consecrating these shrines as if from a tripod!" And below: "On this occasion, deceased creatures also began to be worshipped and invoked—bloodless and half-corrupted bones—to be affected with divine honor, and prayers to be bound to those very places. To all these things the Doctors of the Church not only connived, but also assisted them. Such calamity and pestilence of Christ's field was therefore born in the very Church itself, and among those who especially wished to be considered guardians and watchmen of the Church."

Furthermore, John Calvin, who after many grave disputations with his followers drew the greater part of the Lutherans into his nets and obtained something like a kingdom among Luther's pastors, in that book which he inscribed to Emperor Charles concerning the necessity of reforming the Church, says that the first and greatest cause of dissension between his party and ours is that his followers (that is, all sectarians of our time) worship one God, while ours (that is, Catholics) have so distributed the offices of God among the Saints that they have added them as colleagues to the supreme God, in whose multitude He lies hidden; and that they not only adore Saints in place of God, but even their bones, garments, shoes, and simulacra. In the fourth book of his Institutes, chapter

21, enumerating the causes why he made secession from us with his followers, he places this first: that they can have no assembly with us in which they would not be polluted with open idolatry. What idolatry he claims flourishes among us can be understood from book III, chapter 20, where, speaking of the invocation of Saints, he says: "Each has adopted peculiar gods for himself, in whose protection, no differently than tutelary deities, they have placed their trust: nor are gods now erected only (as the Prophet once reproached Israel) according to the number of cities, but according to the multitude of heads."

I once encountered a man from Calvin's school who, though he seemed otherwise quite humane and candid to me, and I used him familiarly so that I might, if possible, recall him from that madness, I began to ask him what the Calvinists chiefly reproved in our dogmas, what most displeased them, and what finally was the principal cause why they departed from communion with the Church, from obedience to Bishops, from the rest of the company of the faithful, from the footsteps of their ancestors, with such manifest peril of eternal salvation? He responded that this was the principal cause: that we invoke Saints in prayers and that in this way we attribute Divinity to the dead. But these are impostures and most shameless lies. For what Catholic has ever in any way equaled sacred images, or blessed tokens of Saints, or the spirits of Martyrs or Apostles or even Angels, or even the Queen of Heaven and Mother of God, Mary, with the one true God?

Who in the Catholic Church has offered sacrifice (which is owed to God alone) to Saints, or relics, or images? Do we not by

this one external symbol alone, even if no others existed, testify clearly enough that we embrace one God in mind and thought as well, and serve Him alone with a proper and peculiar worship? Do we not openly distinguish between that honor which is owed to God alone and that worship and veneration which is piously and religiously given to God's friends and other sacred things on account of God Himself? But although these are (as we have said) lies and calumnies, nevertheless on account of these very lies innumerable peoples, kingdoms, nations, many thousands of souls redeemed by Christ's blood lie separated from Christ's body, and like branches torn and scattered from a tree by the force of a storm, and like sheep which, having gone out from their fold without any protection of shepherds or dogs, wander in the mountains and daily become prey to infernal wolves.

But since we have said something about lies and calumnies, something must also be said about reproaches and insults. Indeed, so great is the contempt of all Saints in the books and customs of heretics, and so horrible are the blasphemies against all the citizens of heaven, that from this I chiefly marvel greatly at the patience of the Divine Majesty. For, to omit the fact that Calvinists rage against sacred images with such fury that in very many places they have either entirely destroyed them, or defiled them with mud and filth, or deformed them with eyes gouged out and noses and ears cut off; to say nothing of the fact that they everywhere cast down, spit upon, and trample the sign of the cross itself (reverend to Angels, fearsome to demons, salutary to the human race); to pass over this too, that they everywhere, with altars overturned, dig up, consume

in flames, and cast into streams the blessed bodies of Saints which the piety of our ancestors had enclosed in golden and silver cases, and which had been dwelling-places and organs of the Holy Spirit, and which God had often illustrated with signs and prodigies—to pass over all these things, I say, and speak only of verbal insults: What, I ask, did Erasmus of Rotterdam accomplish? Did he not surpass Lucian's impiety by a long interval? For Lucian mocked false and truly ridiculous gods: but this new Lucian most contemptuously treated true citizens of the Angels and true friends and intimates of God, as the Apostle speaks.

In the colloquy which he inscribed "The Shipwreck," he introduces someone asking another whether, with death's peril imminent, he implored the protection of any Saint? He responds: "Not even that. Why not? he says, because heaven is spacious; if I commend my safety to any of the Saints, say to Peter, perhaps he will hear sooner what is at the door before he meets with God; before he explains the case, I will already have perished." These are Erasmus's witty, or rather sacrilegious, jokes. In the same book, in thoroughly Lucianic fashion, he substitutes the most blessed Virgin Mary for Venus in the prefecture of the sea; and did a Christian man dare to compare that Virgin, whom Saint John Chrysostom most truly wrote to be holier and purer than Seraphic spirits, with the most impure harlot?

What of the fact that in the Dialogue on Religious Pilgrimage he was not ashamed to publish a letter feigned in the name of the Virgin Mary, in which the very Mother of Truth is introduced as the author of Luther's false dogmas? For thus that fictitious

Mary writes to Glaucoplutus: "That you, following Luther, strenuously advise that it is superfluous to invoke Saints, know that you have earned good and great thanks from me on this account; for previously I was almost killed by the wicked supplications of mortals. Everything was sought from one, as if my Son were always an infant, because He is so feigned and painted in my lap." But it certainly grieves and shames me to relate such things, with which nevertheless Erasmus's lucubrations everywhere abound.

Now Martin Luther, in his sermon on the Nativity of the Virgin Mary, valued the patronage of the Mother of God so little that he did not hesitate boldly to say he esteemed the prayers of Blessed Mary no more than those of any person from the crowd, because we are all equally holy and just as the Virgin Mary herself and the other Saints, however great they may be.

Let Bernard therefore cease to enumerate Mary's prerogatives. Let Chrysostom no longer say that the Virgin Mother of God is more honored than the Cherubim and incomparably more glorious than the Seraphim. Nor let that voice of Anselm be heard henceforth: that Mary shines with a purity greater than which cannot be conceived under God; for we are all equally just and holy as the Virgin Mary herself. Nothing therefore profited Mary that she first erected the trophy of virginity; that as a Virgin she conceived, bore, and raised God; that she was companion of almost all His journeys, labors, hardships, and troubles, even to the cross, when the disciples fled, following Him, and finally endured the most bitter martyrdom, with the sword of sorrow penetrating her heart. For without so many labors we are all equally just and holy as the

Virgin Mary herself. Without cause did Peter and Paul and the other Apostles traverse the world with such great labor to disseminate the Gospel; in vain did the Martyrs pour out their blood for Christ; empty were the vigils, fasts, solitudes, sleeping on the ground, rough sackcloth, and constant battles with demons of the holy Anchorites, since without so many labors and sweats, Lutherans resting at home in the bosom and embrace of their little wives, well-fed and well-watered, snatch heaven and are equally holy and just as the Virgin Mary herself and the other Saints, however great they may be.

Let us come to the Magdeburgers; for they are those illustrious and most religious historians who, in the former book of the first Century, while expounding Christ's life, wish Blessed Mary to have sinned so gravely when she lost her Son in the temple that they not only do not fear to compare her sin with that first and most grave sin of Eve, but are not afraid to inquire and doubt which might be more serious. The same authors later, in the latter book of the same Century, attribute fifteen lapses and errors to Peter, Prince of the Apostles, teaching that some of these are worthy of eternal torments; and not much below, they reprove the Apostle Paul because he was excessively burdened in Asia and despaired of life, and because he observed Jewish ceremonies in Jerusalem to gratify James, and by that deed confirmed the Jews more in error than helped weak brethren. In the third Century and all the following ones, at the end of the fourth chapter, they accuse all the Fathers of having brought into the Church through their writings not only inconvenient opinions and blemishes, but also errors, stubble,

and smoke, to such a degree that unless Luther had held forth the torch of doctrine to us and seasonably dispersed that darkness, we would all now be blinded and killed by smoke.

What shall we say of that impure and blasphemous Quintin, father of the Libertines in Gaul, who, as Calvin is the authority (in his Instruction against the Libertines, chapter 9), so petulantly raged against all the Saints that he called Paul nothing other than a broken vessel; John, a foolish youth; Matthew, a usurer; Peter, the denier of Christ?

Moreover, Calvin, who so severely argues others of impiety, was himself so pious and religious that, not content with those reproaches with which he vexes all Saints who flourished after Christ's advent, he even extended the scourge of his tongue to those who preceded the same Savior's advent by many centuries. Thus in his books of Christian Institution (book III, chapter 14, §11) he makes Abraham a worshiper of idols; he says Sarah (book III of the Institutes, chapter 2, §31) sinned in many ways when she gave her handmaid to her husband; Rebecca indeed corrupted God's truth with various frauds and impostures while she procures her son's blessing by evil artifice, deceives her husband, and compels Jacob to lie. He reproves Judas Maccabeus (book III, chapter 5, §8) of superstition and misguided zeal because he commanded sacrifice to be offered for the dead. He teaches that Zipporah (book IV, chapter 15, §20) was a foolish woman and sinned gravely because she circumcised her son. Moses himself—than whom ancient times had nothing milder, wiser, or holier—Calvin accuses of arrogance and pride in regard to Exodus chapter 32, namely because

he imperiously prescribed law to God and stripped Him of His justice.

Now concerning the holy men of the New Testament, first he scurrilously jests that if they must hear the prayers of mortals, they ought to have such long ears that they stretch from heaven all the way to earth. Then he contemptuously calls the same ones now dead men, now shadows, now phantoms, now even refuse (in the Institutes, book III, chapter 20, §27). In the book which he inscribed "On the True Method of Reforming the Church," he even called them monsters, executioners, and beasts. Than which contumely and blasphemy scarcely any greater can be conceived. For what if not Calvin himself, but his wife (for it is abominable among them for a Bishop to be created unless he be the husband of at least one wife)—if, I say, Calvin's wife, or children, or friends, or even servants or handmaids, one of us should call phantoms, shadows, refuse, beasts, monsters, executioners, with what mind would Calvin receive this? Would he not think injury was done to him? Would he not bear it most annoyingly and grievously? And will Christ receive with equanimity His most beloved friends, intimates, brothers, and sons, whom He Himself deigns to honor so greatly in heaven that He says in the Apocalypse: "If anyone conquers, I will grant him to sit with me on my throne, as I myself conquered and sat down with my Father on his throne"—will He suffer these most sublime Princes, consorts of the divine kingdom and throne, to be called shadows, phantoms, refuse by one most arrogant worm of the earth? God will certainly not bear this with equanimity, but will

finally afflict all such blasphemers and sacrilegious persons with eternal punishments.

But we also, if we are citizens of the Saints, if we have any zeal of faith, ought to be aroused and inflamed, and moved with religious and pious indignation, most fiercely resist such nefarious men. Let the Lutherans imitate their ancestors—Porphyry, Julian, Vigilantius, Wyclif, and however many ever waged impious wars against the heavenly Saints and, as the poets' fables tell of the giants, wished to overturn and drag down the citizens of heaven from their seats. But let us adhere to the footsteps of our ancestors—Athanasius, Ambrose, Jerome, Paulinus, Augustine, Gregory—who indeed always studied religiously to emulate the glory of the Apostles and Martyrs, to defend their deeds against detractors by disputing with all their strength, and finally to nourish their memory with sermons, honor them with basilicas, celebrate them with songs, propagate them with writings, and consecrate them to eternity. For thus it will come to pass that both those who imitate their crimes may be joined with them in partnership of the same punishments, and we, who have had those as leaders to virtue in this study, may have the same as companions to rewards and crowns. Now let us approach more closely to the matter itself.

Order of Disputation

This disputation is contained in twelve principal questions. The first concerns the beatitude of Saints: whether the souls of Saints see God and are truly blessed before the day of judgment.

For this question is the foundation of all the others, since before Christ's advent the spirits of the Patriarchs and Prophets were not so venerated and invoked as we now venerate and invoke the Apostles and Martyrs, because those were still held captive in hell's prisons.

The second concerns canonization, which follows in its order that first question about beatitude. For after we have learned that holy men who have departed this life reign blessed with God, it will be necessary to learn who those men are—which indeed we cannot know with certainty from any other source than from the public testimony of the Church, which we now call canonization.

The third concerns worship: for when it is established who are those who must be numbered among blessed spirits, it follows that we should ask whether they are to be adored with any kind of adoration.

The fourth concerns their invocation, which is an excellent kind of adoration.

The fifth concerns their relics: whether, namely, not only the spirits of Saints themselves, but also their bodies, or bones and ashes, and other remains of theirs are to be venerated.

The sixth concerns images: whether they are to be venerated, and with what kind of worship.

The seventh, eighth, ninth, tenth, eleventh, and twelfth concern those things by which due worship is exhibited by the Church which sojourns on earth not only to holy men, but to the entire heavenly Jerusalem: that is, concerning basilicas, pilgrimages, vows, vigils, fasts, and feast days.

Editorial Note

This present translation encompasses solely Book Two (Liber Secundus) of St. Robert Bellarmine's Septima Controversia Generalis de Ecclesia Triumphante, which comprises three books in its entirety. Books One and Three of this controversial treatise remain untranslated in the current edition and await future scholarly attention.

The present translation is based upon a digitized edition of Bellarmine's original Latin text, which exhibits numerous deficiencies inherent to the scanning and digitization process of early modern printed materials. Scholars utilizing this translation should be cognizant of several critical limitations arising from the poor resolution and quality of the digital source, which has resulted in significant uncertainty regarding character identification throughout the text.

Particular caution should be exercised regarding paleographical ambiguities affecting numerical references. Roman numerals (I, II, III, etc.) and Arabic numerals (1, 2, 3, etc.) may be incorrectly transcribed due to the similarity of letterforms in sixteenth-century typography. This is especially problematic in biblical citations where chapter and verse numbers may be corrupted—for instance, where "cap. ii" might be misread as "cap. 11" or where verse references like "v. 5" could appear as "v. s." Characters comprising vertical strokes (i, j, u, v, m, n) are frequently indistinguishable in the source material, potentially affecting proper names, cita-

tions, and theological terminology. Similarly, early modern Latin printing conventions employed numerous abbreviations and contractions which may be incorrectly expanded or misinterpreted in the digitization process.

Scripture citations throughout this translation should be verified against reliable critical editions, as the digital source's poor quality has likely resulted in corrupted verse numbers, chapter divisions, and book abbreviations. Similar reservations apply to citations of Church Fathers, conciliar documents, and medieval theological authorities, where reference numbers, page citations, and abbreviated titles may contain transcription errors stemming from the source text's digital inadequacies. Citations of Protestant reformers' works (Luther, Calvin, Melanchthon, et al.) should likewise be independently verified, as publication details, chapter numbers, and specific textual references may be compromised.

Scholars employing this translation for research purposes are strongly urged to cross-reference all citations with authoritative critical editions before incorporating them into scholarly discourse, consult manuscript traditions where available to verify readings of particular significance, compare with other early modern editions of Bellarmine's Controversies to establish textual reliability, and exercise particular scrutiny regarding numerical references, proper names, and technical theological terminology. This translation is offered as a provisional scholarly tool rather than a definitive critical edition, pending future access to superior source materials and comprehensive textual collation.

It should also be noted that Mediatrix Press is currently preparing a complete and scholarly English translation of this controversy, which will include all three books. That forthcoming edition is likely to be far more reliable and textually rigorous than the present work, benefitting from critical collation and access to higher-quality source material. This current translation of Book Two is thus offered as a provisional scholarly tool rather than a definitive critical edition, pending both the availability of superior sources and the publication of Mediatrix Press's full translation.

CHAPTER ONE
ARGUMENTS AGAINST THE VENERATION OF RELICS ARE SET FORTH

We discussed in the previous book the glory and veneration of the Saints; now we must dispute concerning the veneration of those things which pertain to them, that is, of holy relics and images. And, to begin with relics, Eunomius was the first to begin condemning the veneration of holy relics, and after him Vigilantius, if we believe Saint Jerome in his book against Vigilantius. Nor does it contradict this that in the same place, a little below, the same Jerome says that this heresy once erupted against the Church, and that a book was written against it by Tertullian, which is called the Scorpiace; nor even that in his letter to Riparius he traces the origin of this heresy back to the Jews and Samaritans. For truly the first author who expressly asserted this was Eunomius. Indeed, the Gnostics, against whom Tertullian writes his Scorpiace, only denied that martyrdoms should be endured. From this, however, it could be deduced that the bodies of martyrs should not be venerated, although they themselves did not say this expressly. Further-

more, the Jews and Samaritans believe that all bodies are unclean, yet they dispute nothing in particular about the bodies of saints.

After Vigilantius, Emperor Constantine Copronymus, as Suidas writes in his life, ordered all relics to be destroyed everywhere. Jonas writes in book I on the veneration of images that Claudius of Turin suffered from the same heresy. Thomas Waldensis is the authority that the same doctrine also pleased the Wycliffites in tome III, title 44.

Finally, the Lutherans and Calvinists have stirred up the same doctrine in this time. For Luther, in his sermon on the cross, judges that relics should be buried most deeply underground as deceptions of the faithful. Following him, the Magdeburg Centuriators everywhere condemn the veneration of relics, but especially in Century IV, chapter 6, column 456. Calvin does the same in his book on the necessity of reforming the Church, and in his admonition concerning relics.

The arguments of the Wycliffites were two. First, because in Matthew XXIII the Jews are rebuked by the Lord for adorning the tombs of the prophets. Second, because in the tombs which are said to be of saints, there are neither the souls nor the bodies of saints, but only ashes. To these Calvin adds five others in his admonition concerning relics. First, because God hid the body of Moses, as is found in the last chapter of Deuteronomy. The reason is given by all, lest the Jews should worship it. Whence also in the epistle of Jude we read that the Devil contended with the Archangel Michael concerning the body of Moses, because evi-

dently the Devil wanted to manifest it, so that he might give the Jews occasion to worship it.

Second, because Paul in II Corinthians V says that after the resurrection of Christ he does not know Christ according to the flesh; by which words he warns that whatever was carnal in Christ should be consigned to oblivion and held as nothing, so that we may place all our study in seeking and considering him according to the spirit.

Third, because the same Paul to the Colossians II condemns all arbitrary worship, that is, not instituted by God, which he himself calls in Greek ἐθελοθρησκείαν (will-worship), as foolishness, even if it seems to have the appearance of wisdom. But certainly the veneration of relics is not held to be instituted by the Lord, but is voluntary and devised by men.

Fourth, because the desire for relics is never free from superstition; indeed, it is the mother of idolatry. For they cannot be possessed or touched without veneration immediately following; but no measure is applied to veneration without the honor due to Christ being immediately attributed to them. This experience testifies; for as a sign of solemn adoration, candles are now commonly lit before the tombs of martyrs. And this is confirmed; for when Vigilantius objected to Jerome that it was idolatry to light candles before relics, he could respond nothing else than that only little women do this, who have zeal, but not according to knowledge. We can add the Council of Elvira, canon 34, where it is said that the spirits of saints are disturbed by such candles; and Augustine, who

in book on the morals of the Church, chapter 34, reproves the worshippers of tombs.

Fifth, because the greatest part of relics is spurious, and it often happens that we venerate the bones of thieves, or even of dogs or donkeys, in place of the relics of saints. This he proves first, because Augustine in his book on the work of monks, chapter 28, when he had said that certain monks go about carrying and selling the limbs of martyrs, added: "If however they are of martyrs." For if they already began to deceive then, what should we believe is done now? Then, because so many relics of the same kind are found that it is necessary either that the same saint had many bodies, or that many are false relics. These are his arguments, all of which will be refuted in chapter 4.

Furthermore, wherever the Calvinists can, they burn the relics of saints and cast the ashes into rivers. And it should certainly be noted that in the year 1562, the bodies of Saints Irenaeus, Hilary, and Martin were dug up by Calvinists and burned and cast into a flowing stream, as Surius relates. The same thing the pagans had done in the same place to the bodies of other saints 1400 years before. For as Eusebius writes in book V of his history, chapter 3, the pagans cast the relics of martyrs, consumed by fire, into the Rhone. So that we may understand from this how great is the kinship of the Calvinists with the pagans in sacrileges and perfidy. But what the Calvinists accomplish with iron and flames, the Magdeburg Centuriators accomplish with impostures, lies, and frauds, some of which we have thought should be briefly noted here.

CHAPTER TWO
THE LIES OF THE CENTURIATORS ARE EXPOSED

At the beginning, therefore, the Magdeburg Centuriators dispute marvelously concerning the origin of the veneration and worship of relics. For in Century VI, in the very preface, they say that in that century, namely after the year of the Lord 500, the worship of relics began on the occasion of temples which were then being built at enormous expense. However, in Century V, chapter 7, column 744, they say that the worship of relics began in the fifth century itself, that is, before the year 500. Therefore, what they say in the preface of Century VI is not consistent. Furthermore, the same authors in Century IV, chapter 6, column 456, and chapter 13, column 1446, say that in previous centuries, that is, up to the year 300, nothing is found in approved authors concerning the veneration and translation of relics, but that this superstition began in the fourth century, when by order of Julian the Apostate the relics of Saint Babylas were transferred, which translation was made with the greatest solemnity around the year of the Lord 365. For at that time Julian was emperor, as Saint Jerome testifies in his

Chronicle. Therefore, what the Magdeburg Centuriators wrote in Centuries V and VI is not true.

But what they say in this Century IV is also not true. For in the addition to the first Century, in the life of Saint Luke, the same Centuriators confess that before the times of Julian the relics of Saint Andrew and Saint Luke were transferred to Constantinople with the highest honor by Emperor Constantine, as Saint Jerome testifies in his book against Vigilantius.

Moreover, in Century II, chapter 3, column 31 and following, they report word for word from the history of Eusebius, book IV, chapter 15, the letter of the Church of Smyrna concerning the martyrdom of Polycarp. In this letter it is narrated that when Christians desired the relics of the martyr, and Jews most stubbornly resisted, the pagan judge wanted the body placed in the middle to be burned to ashes, and yet the Christians collected those relics with incredible eagerness as if they were (the letter says) more precious than the most precious stones and more proven than the most proven gold. That these relics were collected by Christians for worship is clear both from the words cited and from the contention of the adversaries. For the Jews and pagans resisted lest the relics be seized under the pretext of piety. For they thought that bodies were worshipped by Christians, as Eusebius testifies in the same place. Therefore, what they said in Century IV is not true.

But neither did the honor of relics begin then. For Saint Gregory in book III, epistle 30, writes that at the very time when Peter and Paul suffered, the faithful came from the East who sought their relics as those of their fellow citizens. But when they had car-

ried them as far as the second milestone from the city, they were prevented by a divine miracle from being able to carry them further. Then they were hidden by the Roman faithful at the Catacombs. Whence afterwards Pope Cornelius (as Damasus reports in the Pontifical) transferred them to those places where they now lie. Therefore, the Magdeburg Centuriators have put forth four lies about the origin of the worship of relics, fighting among themselves.

The second lie is in Century IV, chapter 8, column 602, where after they had said that Vigilantius wrote correctly and piously against relics, but Jerome fought for relics only with insults and importunity, they add the testimony of Gregory: "This (they say) also seemed so to Gregory, who thus judged concerning Jerome's writing against Vigilantius: 'Jerome so raved with insults against Vigilantius that I am compelled to desire somewhat more modesty in him.'" But these words belong to no Gregory, but to Erasmus in his argument to the book of Saint Jerome against Vigilantius.

The third is in Century V, chapter 6, column 699, where they have this: "Augustine (they say) writes concerning the relics of Stephen that there was a superstitious and great concourse of multitude to them even into Africa, with certain peoples made mad by illusions which were held as miracles, in book on the City of God XXII, chapter 8." But if we read that entire chapter which they themselves cite, we will not find anywhere the name of superstition or illusion, but such great piety toward the sacred relics that this place of Augustine seems sufficient to dissipate all the mists of

heretics. Among many other things, he says thus concerning a certain miracle: "She is a most illustrious woman, nobly born, nobly married, she lives in Carthage: a great city, a great person, those seeking the matter do not allow it to be hidden," etc. And below: "One miracle was done among us, not greater than those I have mentioned, but so clear and illustrious that I think there is no one of the people of Hippo who has not either seen or learned of this, none who could forget it for any reason."

This is not only a shameless lie of the Magdeburg Centuriators, but also a sin against the Holy Spirit, that they call the most attested miracles of God illusions. And besides, it is manifest insanity, since they make Saint Augustine, a most wise man, as if playing childishly. For when blessed Augustine in that entire chapter strives to prove that the Catholic faith is not lacking in true miracles, would he not be utterly insane and fighting with himself and with faith, if he himself called the miracles by which he says faith is proved illusions, and said that the people who believe in them are superstitious and mad?

The fourth lie is entirely similar to the previous one. For the same Century V, chapter 15, column 1506, they say that the relics of martyrs were despised by pagans, and that they had better sense about this than superstitious Christians think, with Theodoret as authority in book VIII on the martyrs. But Theodoret in that book nowhere holds that the Gentiles had better sense about relics than Christians, but asserts and defends entirely the contrary. See (Reader) the place and be the judge.

The fifth is in Century IV, chapter 13, column 1446, where they relate the story of the translation of Saint Babylas from Rufinus book I, chapter 36. Because the oracle of Apollo had fallen silent due to the proximity of the tomb of Saint Babylas, and therefore Julian the Apostate had ordered the ark of the martyr to be removed from there, the Centuriators say that the Devil deliberately pretended to be hindered by the martyr, so that by this means he might give occasion for that most celebrated translation, and thus introduce the custom of translation and veneration of relics.

But this lie is most shameless. For first, it contradicts all the authors who write about this miracle, namely Chrysostom in his book against the Gentiles, Rufinus book I, chapter 36, Socrates book III, chapter 18, Sozomen book V, chapter 19, and Theodoret book III, chapter 10. Then the following miracle clearly shows that the Devil was seriously afraid. For scarcely had the ark of the martyr been led away from there, when fire descended from heaven and consumed the entire idol from which the Devil poured forth oracles.

Moreover, this was not the first translation of relics. For, as we have already shown, many had preceded much earlier, and the same body of Saint Babylas had previously been transferred from Antioch to that suburb of Daphne, as Chrysostom teaches. Whence afterwards Julian ordered it to be transferred again to Antioch. Therefore, the Devil could not have wanted to introduce the custom of translations by that pretense. Moreover, if the Devil so desires this idolatry toward relics, why has he always instigated Jews, pagans, and heretics to abolish all relics?

The sixth lie is in the same Century IV, chapter 13, column 1447, where they relate from Gregory Nazianzen, oration I against Julian, that two young men, nephews of Emperor Constantius, Gallus and Julian, wanting to build an outstanding church above the tomb of the martyr Mammes, divided the work between themselves. But that part which was being built by Gallus, who was truly pious and faithful, proceeded most happily; but that part which was being built by Julian, who was going to be an apostate and was already corrupted in mind, could never hold together, because the earth, trembling in an unusual manner, continually as if vomited up whatever was cast into the foundations at Julian's expense. Nazianzen says the cause of this miracle was that holy martyrs love each other wondrously. Therefore, the martyr for whom the temple was being built refused that honor because he did not want to be honored by one from whom he foresaw his colleagues would suffer insult. And God himself, who looks into hearts, admitted the work of Gallus as Abel's sacrifice, rejected the work of Julian as Cain's sacrifice. Thus Gregory.

But our Centuriators offer a double opinion about this miracle. They say first that it is rashness to believe that this portent happened through the work of the martyr, because martyrs are not καρδιογνώσται (heart-knowers) and are said to sleep: thus they in the place cited, column 1445. But although martyrs are not by their nature καρδιογνώσται, that is, scrutinizers of hearts, who nevertheless prevents the thoughts of hearts from being revealed to them by God? And although they are said to sleep because they rest from their labors, nevertheless they do not sleep in such a way

as if they do not see or understand. For if it were so, then they would not even live.

They add second, column 1447, that God prevented Julian's building to indicate that that superstitious worship of martyrs displeased him. But if this is so, why did he not prevent the building of Gallus, who was giving effort to the same martyr? Will they also say that God was sleeping and perhaps did not see Gallus's building?

The seventh lie is in the preface of the sixth Century, where they say that relics are worshipped by us with divine honors, and that they are also humbly invoked as if they lived and felt: "They began (they say) to worship, invoke, and affect with divine honor bloodless and half-decayed bones." Calvin has nearly the same in his book on the necessity of reforming the Church: "Not only (he says) do they adore saints in place of Christ, but also their bones, clothes, shoes, and images."

But which of the Catholics has ever invoked relics? Who has ever been heard to say in prayers or litanies: "Holy relics, pray for me"? And who has ever affected them with divine honor or adored them in place of Christ? For we indeed honor and kiss relics as sacred pledges of our patrons, but we neither adore them as God nor invoke them as saints, but venerate them with lesser worship than the spirits of saints, much less than God himself. Thus Jerome also responded long ago to Vigilantius making the same objection, and much earlier the disciples of Saint Polycarp responded the same way in Eusebius, in the place cited before, book IV of his history, chapter 15.

CHAPTER THREE
THE TRUTH IS ASSERTED AND PROVEN

Now let us proceed to the arguments in favor of the truth. The first can be taken from the examples in Scripture. In Exodus XIII, Moses, about to depart with the people from Egypt into Palestine, was unwilling to leave there the bones of Saint Joseph, who had died long ago, but carried them away with him in an honorable manner and transferred them to the promised land. Therefore, it is neither superstitious nor novel to transfer the bones of saints, as the Magdeburg writers cry out in their individual centuries. Likewise, in the last chapter of Deuteronomy, God himself (as Jerome argues against Vigilantius) honored the body of Moses when he buried it with his own hands. Likewise, in IV Kings XIII, the bones of Elisha, when they touched a certain dead man, immediately restored him to life. Therefore, God did not despise the bones of saints, but honors them and desires them to be honored, while through them he accomplished so remarkable a miracle. Likewise, in IV Kings XXIII, when Josiah was overturning the shrines of idols and wished to destroy all idolatry, so far was he from thinking that the relics of saints should be destroyed that, al-

though he had dug up the bones of other dead men and reduced them to ashes, he nevertheless ordered that the bones of the holy prophet found there should be preserved.

Moreover, concerning the sepulcher of the Lord, we read in Isaiah XI: "The nations shall hope in him" (that is, the Messiah), "and his sepulcher shall be glorious" [1]. That this passage is understood concerning the sepulcher of Christ is certain, both from the words themselves and from the Apostle in Romans XV. But that it is not understood only of the sepulcher for that time when Christ lay there, but also for future time, and therefore that relics are to be honored, Jerome teaches in his epistle to Marcella, when he urges her to migrate to Bethlehem, where he teaches that Isaiah predicted what now happens, that the sepulcher of the Lord should be honored by all. From this is refuted Luther's blasphemy, who in his book "On Abolishing the Mass" says that God has no greater care for the sepulcher of the Lord than for oxen.

Finally, if Christ were present here and we devoutly kissed his garment, immediately Luther and Calvin would say we were idolaters; but the woman with the hemorrhage faithfully touched only the fringe of Christ's garment and was healed, Matthew IX. Nor are the people reproved in Acts V who competed to touch Peter's shadow in whatever way they could, but rather they are said to have received the reward of their faith; and yet what relics more worthless than a shadow itself can be conceived? Nor were they considered superstitious in Acts XIX who carried away Paul's

[1] Isa. XI, 10.

handkerchiefs and aprons to the sick, just as we do now, but rather God confirmed their religion with miracles.

The second argument is from councils of different parts of the world. From the East we have the Second Council of Nicaea, Act 3, which calls relics "salutary fountains" through which God bestows many benefits upon men; and in Act 7, in the final definition, it orders that a cleric be deposed and a layman excommunicated who despises the relics of martyrs and does not treat them as sacred things with honor.

Likewise, from the East we have the Council of Gangra, held 1200 years ago, in the final canon, where it pronounces anathema on those who execrate the memorials of martyrs, that is, the places where the relics of martyrs are located. For the Eustathians, against whom the council was convened, were unwilling to enter the basilicas of martyrs, lest they seem to venerate the bodies of martyrs, which they considered unclean.

From Africa, the Fifth Council of Carthage, canon 14, orders that no altars or memorials of martyrs be dedicated unless there are some relics of martyrs there; and those dedicated otherwise should be overturned, or the people should be warned not to frequent those places, lest they be held by some superstition if they worship as the sepulcher of a martyr where there is truly no body of a martyr. But if it is superstition to worship as the body of a martyr that which is not truly such, then it will be religion to worship the body of a true martyr; for superstition is opposed to religion.

From Spain we have the Third Council of Braga, canon 5, where it is established that in supplications the reliquary should be carried in the hands of bishops or other priests, with the people preceding and following.

The Council of Epaon, celebrated in Gaul, canon 25, orders that relics of saints not be placed in churches where there are no clerics who serve the sacred ashes with the frequency of psalmody.

From Germany we have the Council of Mainz, celebrated in the time of Charlemagne, in whose canon 51 it is established that the bodies of saints not be transferred from place to place without the counsel of the bishop and the permission of the holy synod. This certainly pertains to no small honor of the holy relics.

Finally, we have from Italy the Lateran Council under Innocent III, chapter 62, where it is provided, on account of the danger of frauds, that no one should begin to venerate new relics publicly without the authority of the supreme pontiff. Whence comes the canonical law in the chapter "Cum ex eo," concerning relics and the veneration of saints; similar to which is also the civil law, Code concerning Bishops and Clerics, law "Decernimus."

Third, it is proven from the Fathers. Eusebius, book VII of his History, chapter 15, concerning the wooden seat of Saint James the Apostle: "It is preserved," he says, "with great care, as a memory of sanctity handed down by our ancestors, and it is held with great veneration." Thus he speaks. Therefore, let not the Lutherans laugh if they sometimes hear that the wooden chair of Saint Peter is honored at Rome.

CHAPTER 3

Saint Athanasius, in the Life of Blessed Anthony, writes that a worn cloak was left to him by Anthony, and adds: "The legatee of blessed Anthony, who had merited to receive the worn cloak with the sheepskin by his command, embraces Anthony in Anthony's gifts, and as if enriched with a great inheritance, joyfully recalls the image of sanctity through the garment." Concerning the same great Anthony, Jerome relates in the Life of Paul the First Hermit that when Anthony had obtained Paul's tunic woven from palm leaves, out of reverence for Paul himself, he was accustomed to wear it only on the solemn days of Easter and Pentecost.

Saint Basil, on Psalm CXV, on the passage "Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his saints" [2]: "When," he says, "someone died in the Jewish manner, the corpses were abominable; when death occurs for Christ, the relics of his saints are precious. Previously it was said to priests and those dedicated to God: 'He shall not be contaminated by any dead person'; but now whoever touches the bones of a martyr assumes a certain fellowship of sanctification from the grace residing in the body." And in his oration on the Forty Martyrs, speaking of their relics dispersed throughout that entire region: "These are they," he says, "who administer our region and, like certain towers standing together, provide security from the attack of enemies, not confining themselves to one place, but having already become guests in many places and adorning many fatherlands."

Gregory of Nyssa, in his oration on Theodore the Martyr, at the beginning of the oration: "The soul indeed," he says, "since

---

[2] Psal. CXV, 15.

it departed on high, rests in its place and, freed from the body, lives together with its peers. But the venerable and immaculate body, his instrument, having been arranged and adorned with much honor and worship, is situated in an august and sacred place." Then he narrates at length that those who enter the temples of martyrs first marvel at the mass of the building, then at the walls and floor beautifully adorned, then at the various statues and paintings, and finally adds: "When," he says, "one has delighted his eyes with these things, he desires next to approach the tomb itself, believing that touching it brings sanctification and blessing. And if someone permits even the dust with which the tomb where the martyr's body rests is covered to be taken away, the dust is received as a gift and collected like something of great value to be treasured; for to touch the relics themselves, if at any time such favorable fortune occurs that it is permitted to do this, how much this is to be desired and wished for, and a gift of the highest prayers, those who have experienced it and have been made partakers of that desire know."

Gregory Nazianzen, in oration 1 against Julian, a little before the middle, reproaching Julian because while he venerated monuments of false gods, he despised the bodies of the friends and martyrs of the true God: "Did you not revere," he says, "the victims slain for Christ? (and after some intervening words) whose bodies alone can do the same as holy souls, whether they are touched by hands or honored; whose blood drops alone and small signs of passion can do the same as bodies. These you do not worship, but despise and reject, you who admire the pyre of Hercules, raised from calamity and injuries inflicted on women."

Eusebius of Emesa, or rather Caesarius of Arles, or whoever is the author of those homilies, in the homily on Saint Blandina: "Where are those," he says, "who say that veneration should not be shown to the sacred bodies of martyrs, etc."

Saint Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem, in catechesis 18: "But so that," he says, "not only the soul of saints should be honored and believed in, that there is also power or strength in the bodies of the dead, the dead man lying in the sepulcher of Elisha, touching the dead prophet's body, was brought to life."

Saint John Chrysostom, in his sermon on Saints Juventius and Maximus, first praises those who piously seized those bodies left unburied, even at the risk of their own lives. Then he adds: "Therefore let us visit them more often, let us adore their tombs, and with great faith let us touch their relics, so that we may obtain some blessing from there." See the same author in his last homily on the epistle to the Romans, where he says Rome excels all cities because of the bodies of Peter and Paul. Likewise, homily 61 to the people, where he compares the sepulchers and relics of saints with the sepulchers and corpses of emperors and kings, and shows that the former are worshiped with the highest honor, while the latter are deserted and cast aside; and he beautifully says that it was the highest honor for Emperor Constantine that he could become the doorkeeper of Blessed Peter, because he was buried at the doors of his basilica, where some particles of Blessed Peter's relics were deposited.

Theodoret, book VIII to the Greeks, concerning martyrs: "The souls indeed," he says, "of the triumphant martyrs now live

the life of angels in the heavenly fatherland, mingled with the choirs of angels; but their bodies are not buried individually in separate monuments, but cities, towns, and village assemblies have divided these among themselves by lot, and they do not cease to profess them as salutary for laboring souls and sick bodies."

Finally, John Damascene, book IV, chapter 16 of the Orthodox Faith, discusses at length the veneration of martyrs' relics.

Now from the Latin writers, Saint Ambrose, sermon 93 on Saints Nazarius and Celsus, at the end: "But if you say to me," he says, "why do you honor flesh already dissolved and consumed? I honor in the martyr's flesh the scars received for Christ's name; I honor the memory of the living one with the perpetuity of virtue; I honor the ashes consecrated through confession of the Lord; I honor in the ashes the seeds of eternity; I honor the body that showed me to love the Lord, that taught me not to fear death for the Lord's sake. But why should not the faithful honor that body which even demons revere? which they afflicted in torture but glorify in the sepulcher? Therefore I honor the body that honored Christ in the sword, that will reign with Christ in heaven."

Maximus, in his sermon on Saints Octavius, Adventor, and Solutor: "All martyrs," he says, "are to be most devoutly venerated, but those should be especially venerated by us whose relics we possess."

Gaudentius, Bishop of Brescia, in his treatise on the dedication of the basilica: "That we might have venerable relics of saints, our God granted; then that we might be able to found this basilica

in their honor, he himself bestowed, etc." See the entire treatise, where he speaks much about the cult of relics.

Saint Paulinus, on the third birthday of Saint Felix, speaking of the city of Rome on account of the relics of the apostles, says thus: "For previously by empire alone and victorious arms, Now also by apostolic sepulchers you are first of lands."

In the same place: "At the martyr's tomb you owe crowns to the earth."

Prudentius, in the hymn on Saint Lawrence: "O thrice, four times, O seven times Blessed inhabitant of the city, Who celebrates the seat of their bones Near to you and yours.

To whom it is permitted to roll near, Who sprinkles the place with tears, Who presses his breast to the ground, Who pours out vows in murmurs.

Scarcely is the fame known to the hidden ones, How full of saints Rome is, How rich the urban soil Flourishes with sacred sepulchers."

Saint Jerome, in his book against Vigilantius: "It grieves him," he says, "that martyrs' relics are covered with precious cloth and are not bound with rags or sackcloth or thrown on a dunghill, so that Vigilantius alone, drunk and sleeping, might be adored." The same author, in his epistle to Marcella, which he wrote in the name of Paula and Eustochia, among other good things that are in Palestine, numbers the ability to adore the sacred ashes of John the Baptist, Elisha, and Obadiah, which are preserved there.

Rufinus, book XI of his History, chapter 28, when the Gentiles in Julian's time were burning the bones of Blessed John the

Baptist at Sebaste in Palestine: "Certain people," he says, "seeing such a sacrilege being committed by human hands indeed but with a bestial mind, preferring to die rather than be polluted by such an impious act, mixed among those who were gathering bones for burning, collecting more diligently and religiously, secretly withdrew from those who were either stupefied or raging, and carried the venerable relics to the religious father Philip, etc." See the same author in the same book, chapter 33.

Saint Augustine, epistle 103 to Quintianus: "They carry indeed" (the bearers of the letter) "relics of the most blessed and most glorious martyr Stephen, which your holiness knows, as we too have done, how fittingly you ought to honor."

The author of the book "On Ecclesiastical Doctrines," chapter 73: "We believe that the bodies of saints, and especially the relics of blessed martyrs, should be honored most sincerely as members of Christ."

Saint Leo, in his sermon on Saint Lawrence, speaking of his gridiron: "For what," he says, "did your genius not discover for the glory of the victor, when even the instruments of torture passed into the honor of triumph?"

Saint Gregory, book V, epistle 50, to Palladius: "Since we have provided," he says, "relics of the holy apostles Peter and Paul, as well as of the martyrs Lawrence and Pancras, with veneration, we exhort that you ought to receive and place them with reverence, with the Lord's help." He repeats the same in the following epistle. The same author, book III, epistle 30, responding to Empress Constantia who was requesting the head of Saint Paul, says it is sacrile-

gious to touch or look upon the bodies of such great saints. And there he narrates that many have died sudden deaths because they presumed to approach too closely to touch or look upon the bodies of saints; and finally he promises to send something from the filings of Saint Paul's chains, if he can scrape off anything by filing; for such is the condition of those chains that according to the worthiness or unworthiness of those asking, either filings are immediately struck from the chains by the file without any delay, or nothing at all can be struck off, even if someone labors with all his strength in filing.

Saint Gregory of Tours, in his book "On the Glory of Martyrs and Confessors," treats scarcely anything else, so that it would be superfluous to wish to extract anything from it. I omit Bede, Bernard, and later writers, since even adversaries do not doubt their faith.

Fourth, it is proven from miracles performed at relics, which certainly would not happen if the worship of relics did not please God. Saint Epiphanius, in the Life of Isaiah, Ezekiel, and Jeremiah, writes that their sepulchers were customarily worshiped by many on account of the many benefits that God conferred in those places through the merits of those same prophets.

Saint Basil, in his oration on Mammas, says that the miracles by which the martyr restored health to some and life to others are known to all. And in his oration on Julitta, he writes that when the relics of Saint Julitta had been brought to a certain place where there was a shortage of water, immediately a spring of sweetest water burst forth from the earth, so that it seemed that holy woman,

like a common mother or nurse, was nourishing that entire region with her milk.

Saint Gregory Nazianzen, in his oration on Cyprian: "The dust of Cyprian can do all things," he says, "with faith, as those know who have themselves experienced it and have transmitted the miracle to us."

Saint Chrysostom, in his book against the Gentiles, concerning the relics of Saint Babylas the Martyr: "The daily miracles," he says, "that are performed by martyrs abundantly create faith in our teachings."

Palladius, in the Lausiac History, chapter 62, narrates many miracles performed at the relics of Philemon. Saint Ambrose, in his sermon on Saints Gervasius and Protasius, and in his epistle to his sister concerning the same, among many miracles performed, also relates that a blind man named Severus, a butcher by trade, very well known to all, was cured by touching the bier on which the relics were carried. There the same Blessed Ambrose does not keep silent that the Arians most impudently dared to deny those miracles which the entire people saw.

Saint Jerome, in his book against Vigilantius: "You," he says, "have often been tortured by this most worthless dust," where he addresses the demon who through Vigilantius's mouth had called the relics of saints "most worthless dust"; and in his epistle to Eustochia on the life of Paula, he narrates that at the sepulchers of Elisha and John the Baptist and Obadiah, demons were accustomed to roar. In the Life of Hilarion, he says great signs are performed daily at his sepulcher.

CHAPTER 3

Saint Augustine, book XXII of the City of God, chapter 8, says so many miracles were performed at the relics of Saint Stephen in the briefest time that many books would have to be written if all should be related. Sulpicius, in the Life of Martin, says that a woman was cured from a flow of blood by the mere touch of his garment. Countless other things of this kind could be related.

Fifth, it is proven from miracles that are often seen in the very dead bodies of saints, through which God most clearly seems to invite us, as it were, to their veneration. Saint John Chrysostom writes in his sermon on Saints Juventius and Maximus that the faces of their bodies began to shine so after death that one could not look upon them without a certain honor, and they were exactly such as Saint Luke describes Stephen's face in Acts VI when he says: "They looked upon his face as the face of an angel" [3].

Saint Jerome, in the Life of Hilarion, writes that his body was found after ten months still completely intact and fragrant with such odors that it seemed anointed with perfumes. Saint Augustine, sermon 2 on Saint Vincent, says his body, exposed to wild beasts, was miraculously defended by a raven, and when thrown into the waters could not be submerged. And in book IX of the Confessions, chapter 7, he says the bodies of Saints Gervasius and Protasius were preserved incorrupt by God for many years, so that they might be revealed in their time.

Sulpicius, in his epistle to Bassulus the Priest, concerning the death of Saint Martin, says that after his death there appeared

---

[3] Act. VI, 15.

in his very body the form of a glorified man; for his flesh was purer than glass, whiter than milk, so that it showed the beauty of a seven-year-old boy. Saint Bonaventure relates the same thing about the body of Saint Francis. Concerning Saint Edward, King of the English, who flourished 400 years ago, the author of his life writes in Surius, in the month of January, in the 36th year after his death, that his body was found intact, full of juice, flexible, as if he were still living then, and not only the bones and flesh were in no way damaged, but neither the hairs of his head or beard, nor even his clothes or shoes. What shall we say of the body of Saint Andrew, from which a marvelous liquid perpetually flows?

I myself saw at Bologna the body of Blessed Catherine intact and incorrupt, although that holy virgin departed from this life more than a hundred years ago. I also saw at Monte Falco in Umbria the body of Blessed Clare equally intact and incorrupt, although that most blessed virgin died 300 years ago; and what can seem an even greater miracle, in her heart are seen the instruments of the Lord's passion formed from the very flesh with such admirable art that all who see them are compelled to say, "Truly the finger of God is here." And, to pass over many other things, what shall I finally say about my fellow citizen and most blessed patroness Agnes of Montepulciano? She flourished 300 years ago, and both living and dead performed many great miracles, one of which happened to me as a boy, of which not only I but the entire city was witness. I have seen her incorrupt and most beautiful body more than once. Concerning her it has also been recorded in writing by approved authors that when Saint Catherine of Siena came

to see and venerate her sacred body, a rain of heavenly dew, like manna, descended from heaven upon both by divine dispensation. And when the citizens were thinking of conditioning that sacred body with aromatics so that it might be preserved longer, immediately the sweetest liquid like balsam began to flow and stream from that body, so that all understood that the body, seasoned by divine grace, needed no other aromatics. Remains of that divine liquid are still preserved in the church with the body itself.

Sixth, it is proven from the discovery and revelation of saints' bodies made by divine intervention. For if the worship of relics did not please God, why would he himself show to his servants the bodies of saints that were hidden? The bodies of Saints Gervasius and Protasius were revealed to Saint Ambrose by divine intervention, as he himself writes in his epistle on this matter, which is recorded in the volumes of Surius. Saint Augustine also writes the same thing in book IX of the Confessions, chapter 7. There exists also an epistle of Lucian in which he indicates that the bodies of Saints Stephen, Nicodemus, and others were shown to him by divine intervention. That it was truly the body of Stephen, innumerable miracles showed, concerning which Evodius wrote two books. And Blessed Augustine, sermon 91 of the new ones: "His body" (Stephen's) "lay hidden for so long a time; it came forth when God willed, it illuminated the lands, it performed so many miracles; dead, he makes the living dead, because he is not dead."

Moreover, Sozomen relates, book V, chapter 8, that the bones of the holy martyrs Nestabius and Eusebius, brothers, which the people of Gaza had mixed with the bones of camels and don-

keys so that they could not be distinguished by Christians, were shown by divine revelation to a certain holy woman and collected by her. The same Sozomen, book VII, final chapter, relates that the bones of Habakkuk and Micah were revealed by divine intervention to a certain bishop. The same Sozomen, book IX, chapter 2, relates that the relics of the forty martyrs were found by divine revelation.

Bede, in "On the Six Ages," in the section on Martian, relates that the head of John the Baptist was revealed by John himself to two monks; and in the section on Zeno, he writes that the body of Saint Barnabas was found with the Gospel of Matthew upon his breast, Barnabas himself revealing it.

Seventh, it is proven from the translation of relics from one place to another for the sake of honor, customarily celebrated by the ancients. For it cannot be denied that translations of sacred bones pertain to honor. The first and most ancient translation was of the bones of Joseph from Egypt to Palestine, performed by Moses, Exodus XIII. Then the translation of the relics of Peter and Paul, which was made at the very time when they suffered, to the Catacombs, Gregory book III, epistle 30. Then the translation of their bodies from the Catacombs, partly to the Vatican, partly to Lucina's estate on the Ostian Way, Pope Cornelius, epistle 1. Rufinus, book II, chapter 28, describes the translation of the relics of John the Baptist from Palestine to Alexandria.

Saint Jerome, in his book against Vigilantius, writes that in the time of Emperor Constantine, the relics of Andrew, Luke, and Timothy were translated to Constantinople; and in the time of Ar-

cadius, the relics of Samuel the Prophet were translated from Judea to Thrace with such honor that the relics were carried by bishops in a golden vessel, with such a great multitude of peoples accompanying that the crowds of peoples were joined from Palestine all the way to Chalcedon.

Saint Ambrose, at the beginning of his exhortation to virgins: "I," he says, "invited to the Bolognese banquet, where the translation of the holy martyr was celebrated, have reserved for you gifts full of sanctity and grace." Augustine, book IX of the Confessions, chapter 7: "When," he says, "the bodies of Saints Gervasius and Protasius were revealed and dug up and transferred with due honor, etc." Chrysostom, in his book on Babylas, describes with what honor the martyr's relics were translated. Sozomen, book VII, chapter 10, describes the translation of the relics of Saint Meletius of Antioch. Theodoret, book V, chapter 36, describes the translation of the relics of Chrysostom. Evagrius, book I, chapter 16, describes the honorable translation of Saint Ignatius to Antioch under Theodosius the Younger.

Eighth, it is proven from the fact that relics are placed under altars, which Saint Ambrose mentions in his exhortation to virgins, concerning the relics of Vitalis and Agricola, and in his epistle to his sister, concerning the discovery of the bodies of Gervasius and Protasius. Saint Jerome, in his book against Vigilantius. Prudentius, in hymn 11 on the crowns of saints, which is about Saint Hippolytus. Saint Augustine, sermon 11 on the saints. Sozomen, book V, chapter 8, and the Fifth Council of Carthage, canon 14. But this custom seems to have begun in the time of the apostles; for

therefore the souls of martyrs were shown to John in the Apocalypse VI under the altar in heaven, because their bodies rest under altars on earth, as Augustine suggests in the noted place. Furthermore, that this place assigned to relics pertains to great honor, Jerome and Augustine teach in the noted places, and the thing itself teaches this. For altars were always held in great honor, so that they were also in their own way adored, for Tertullian, in his book "On Penitence," places among Christian rites kneeling before the altars of God.

Ninth, it is proven from the use of candles and lamps with which sacred relics are honored; for that light is a sign of honor and it is not superstitious to light a lamp before an inanimate thing, even when the sun is shining, is clear from the candlestick that always burned before the ark of testimony, Exodus XXV. That there was a custom of lighting candles before relics is clear from Vigilantius's objection recorded by Jerome: "We see," he says, "masses of candles lit while the sun is shining, etc." And from Jerome himself in his epistle to Riparius: "Therefore, are candles lit before their tombs signs of idolatry?"

Likewise from Constantine, who, as is recorded in the first volume of councils in the Life of Sylvester, among other gifts that he offered to the sacred relics of Peter, Paul, Lawrence, and the holy Cross, many candlesticks are numbered, many lamps that ought to burn perpetually. Nor is it credible that Constantine offered anything that had not been in use previously in the Church. Moreover, Theodoret, in his History, book V, chapter 36, testifies

that in the translation of the relics of Saint Chrysostom, very many lit lamps were carried before.

Paulinus, on the third birthday of Felix, describing the worship that was given to Saint Felix: "Golden, he says, now the white thresholds are adorned with veils, The bright altars are crowned with dense lamps, The fragrant thresholds are perfumed with waxen papers. Night and day they shine, so night and the splendor of day Gleam, and the day itself, illustrated with heavenly honor, Shines more, its light doubled by innumerable lamps."

Gregory, book III of the Dialogues, chapter 24, mentions a lamp that burned even at night, while all were sleeping, in the temple of Saint Peter.

Tenth, it is proven by reasoning drawn from the useful and from the honorable. The reasoning drawn from the useful is found in Chrysostom in his book on Saint Babylas the Martyr. For God, as Chrysostom says, left scarcely anything more useful to us for salvation than the relics of saints; for nothing more effectively represents and fixes in the mind the memory of saints than their very sepulcher; for immediately when we see the sepulcher of some saint, we recall him and his virtues—patience, charity, chastity, piety—and at the same time we think how great glory he enjoys in heaven for the very brief labor of this life, etc.

The reasoning drawn from the honorable is manifold. First, the bodies of saints were organs of souls for every good work. See Tertullian "On the Resurrection of the Flesh." Second, they were and are instruments of God for miracles. Third, they are pledges of patrons. Fourth, they are spoils of the dearest ones. Fifth, they

are trophies of the triumphant. Sixth, they are destined for incredible glory, namely, that after the resurrection they should be bodies brighter than the sun, and so much superior to all bodies that they merit to be placed above all things. For these and other reasons, the relics of saints are held in high esteem by the faithful and are honored with due worship.

CHAPTER FOUR
THE ARGUMENTS OF ADVERSARIES ARE RESOLVED

From what has been said, it will not be difficult to resolve the arguments which we proposed at the beginning.

Therefore, to the first argument, which was drawn by John Wycliffe from the Gospel, we respond that the Lord did not reproach the Jews because they built or adorned the monuments of the Prophets, but because they did not imitate those whose monuments they adorned, but rather those who killed them, and thus condemned themselves. For nearly all the Fathers explain that passage in this way, such as Hilary, Jerome, Chrysostom, Theophylact on chapter 23 of Matthew, and Ambrose and Bede on chapter 11 of Luke. "By the building of tombs for the Prophets," says Ambrose, "they accused those who killed them of their crime, and by the emulation of similar deeds they also declared themselves heirs of their fathers' iniquity: therefore it is not the building, but the emulation that is considered as criminal." These are his words. And Chrysostom in homily 75 on Matthew says: "It is not because they build, nor because they accuse their fathers, that he said 'woe to

them,' but because in acting thus and speaking thus, they dared to condemn their fathers, when they themselves were committing worse things."

You will say: But in Luke 11, the Lord says: "Truly you bear witness that you consent to the works of your fathers, for they killed the Prophets, and you build their tombs" ([1]). Here the Lord seems to accuse the very building itself as testimony of consent to the slaying of the Prophets.

Chrysostom responds in the cited passage that the Jews were accustomed to build tombs of the Prophets not to honor the Prophets, but to show the strength and power of their ancestors, who were able to kill the Prophets. For although the Jews would say this was not their intention, but entirely the contrary, nevertheless it is clear that this was truly their intention, because they sought to kill the Lord of the Prophets.

Jerome in chapter 23 of Matthew explains it somewhat differently, for he says that the ancient Jews killed the Prophets out of pride; but the more recent ones built tombs for the same ones out of pride and ambition, and therefore by that deed consented to the works of their fathers. Cajetan explains quite appropriately that one who buries someone who has been killed can do this either to honor the dead person, or to complete the act of the murderer; for ordinarily people are killed and afterwards buried so that the crime may be hidden. But the Jews, even if they said they built tombs of the Prophets to honor them, nevertheless seemed to do this to complete the works of their fathers, as is clear from the fact that

[1] Luk. XI, 48

they themselves afterwards killed the greater Prophets, that is, Christ and some of the Apostles.

To the second argument, I say that in monuments there is present, at minimum, the memory of the Saints; for hence the tombs of Saints among the ancients are everywhere called "memories" (memoriae). Moreover, the memory of Saints is honorable. Otherwise, neither is the soul or flesh of Christ now present in Christ's tomb, and yet according to Isaiah chapter 11, his tomb will be glorious. I say further that in the tombs of Saints is found the other part of their substance, that is, that very matter which the spirits of the Saints animated and will animate again.

To Calvin's first argument about the body of Moses, it can be answered in many ways. Hilary in chapter 17 of Matthew, Ambrose in book 1 of De Cain chapter 2, and Gregory of Nyssa in the Life of Moses say that Moses has not yet died, and therefore has not been buried, but was translated with Enoch and Elijah, which some of the more recent teachers also teach. But this cannot easily be defended, and Rupert attacks that opinion with firm arguments in the last chapter of Deuteronomy. Philo at the end of his books On the Life of Moses teaches that Moses indeed died and was buried, but that it pertains to the glory of Moses that he was buried in a tomb so wonderful that no man was ever worthy to look upon it. To this also Oecumenius seems to allude in the Epistle of Jude. It is probable, however, what Chrysostom writes in homily 5 on Matthew, that Moses' tomb was hidden lest it be worshipped by the Jews as God.

You will say: they did not worship Moses when living as God, therefore much less would they have worshipped him when dead. I respond: they did not worship him when living because they heard daily from him that there is one true God and that he was His servant. But after death, remembering his wonders and not hearing his words, they could easily have been led to believe he was God and to adore him if they knew where he was, especially since it is very credible that his body, although dead, still preserved the splendor of countenance and beauty which it had before, as has happened to many Saints. We have an example in the bronze serpent; for in Numbers 21, at Moses' command, the Jews who were struck by serpents looked upon that bronze serpent and were healed; yet they did not adore it with the worship of latria (latria), because Moses had told them that serpent was not God, but only a sign of salvation. But in 4 Kings 18, they sacrificed to the same serpent as to God, when it no longer worked any miracles, and therefore it was broken by Hezekiah.

You will say: the same danger exists now with the relics of other Saints. I respond that this is false: for the people of the Jews at that time were most inclined to idolatry, so that they even worshipped golden calves. Hence after the Babylonian captivity, because that people no longer worshipped idols, we see that God illuminated the tombs of Isaiah, Ezekiel, Jeremiah, Elisha, Obadiah, and others with many miracles, and received favorably the worship which was shown to their bones, as Epiphanius and Jerome relate. Add to this that it has never been heard among Christians that any have offered divine honors to the relics of Saints. Nor are there

lacking in the Church those who teach the people, both in writings and sermons, what worship is owed to relics.

To the second argument, I say that in 2 Corinthians 5, when it is said: "Even if we have known Christ according to the flesh, yet now we know him no more" (2), by "flesh" is understood mortality and passibility; and the meaning is: if we once knew Christ as mortal and passible, now we do not know him except as immortal and impassible, just as in 1 Corinthians 15 it is said: "Flesh and blood shall not possess the kingdom of God." And in Hebrews 5: "Who in the days of his flesh offered prayers and supplications," etc. (3) All explain it thus: Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Oecumenius, Ambrose, Anselm, etc.

In the same way the Seventh Synod, act 6, responded to the same argument which had been objected by the Iconoclasts. Where also is added the testimony of Saint Cyril. And that the Apostle does not wish to teach (what Calvin says) that everything carnal in Christ should be handed over to oblivion and dismissed, that is, all memory of his humanity, so that we think only of his spirit and divinity, is clear; for Paul in 1 Corinthians 11 says the Sacrament of the Eucharist was instituted in memory of the passion, and adds: "As often as you eat this bread and drink this cup, you proclaim the Lord's death until he comes" (4): and he himself repeats nothing more frequently than the cross, passion, and death of the Lord. And how, I ask, according to Isaiah chapter 11, would his tomb be

---

2 II. Cor. V. 16.

3 I. Cor. XV, 50; Hebr. V, 7.

4 1. Cor. XI, 21.

glorious if we ought to forget the Lord's death? Finally, either we ought to recall the Lord's benefits or not: if not, we are most ungrateful and contradict Paul, who in Hebrews 12 says: "Consider him who endured such contradiction from sinners against himself" ([5]). If so, therefore we ought to think upon the incarnation, nativity, passion, and death of the Lord.

To the third argument, I say first that the worship of relics is not voluntary worship, that is, devised by men, but is inspired by God, as is clear from the cited Scriptures; for Scripture approves the worship of Christ's tomb and hem; likewise Peter's shadow, Paul's handkerchiefs and aprons, etc.

I say second that in Paul, Colossians 2, ἐθελοθρησκεία (ethelothreskeia) does not signify worship that is somehow voluntary, that is, not commanded by God but devised by man, but superstitious worship, as our interpreter correctly translates it, or false religion, as Saint Jerome explains in his epistle to Algasia, question 10. Therefore Calvin would have to prove that the worship of relics is superstitious or false, if he wanted it to be reproved by Paul.

To the fourth argument: I deny there is danger of idolatry; indeed, the worship of relics is the detestation of all idolatry. For the Martyrs died to destroy idolatry; therefore whoever worships the relics of a Martyr indicates that he rejoices in the destruction of idolatry. And rightly the Christians, according to Rufinus book 1, chapter 35, when they were transferring the relics of Babylas, sang with a loud voice: "Let all who worship graven images be confounded."

---

[5] Hebr. XII, 3.

CHAPTER 4

Regarding the matter of candles, I say that candles lit before the tombs of Martyrs are not a sign of adoration owed to God; for candles are not offered to Martyrs as sacrifices, but are lit as a sign of joy. For fire is usually lit to signify joy even in secular matters. Moreover, fire is a sign of glory, whence fire was carried before Roman Emperors and Empresses everywhere, as Herodian testifies in book 1. But the Saints now enjoy true glory and reign and rule with Christ in heaven, so that fire can worthily be lit in memory of them. Finally, fire is a sign of life; therefore by candles we attest that the souls of Saints live, and that their very bodies will live in their own time.

Regarding Jerome, I say when he says of those who light candles before relics: "I confess they have zeal for God, but not according to knowledge," he speaks of those who light candles thinking that the Martyrs are thereby illuminated; for Vigilantius had said ironically: "Such people show great honor to the most blessed Martyrs, whom they think are illuminated by the cheapest little candles." Therefore Jerome says of those who light candles with such false opinion that they have zeal, but not according to knowledge.

But that Jerome absolutely thought it good to light candles before relics is clear first, because in his epistle to Riparius he himself brings forward as an argument for the worship of Saints the custom of lighting candles; and in his book against Vigilantius he says: "The Apostles once complained that the ointment was wasted, but they were corrected by the Lord's voice. For neither did Christ need ointment, nor do Martyrs need the light of candles: yet

that woman acted in honor of Christ, and the devotion of her mind was received, and whoever lights candles according to their faith has merit." And below: "That was done to idols, and therefore is detestable; this is done to Martyrs, and therefore is to be received." Second, the same is clear because in Jerome's time there was the custom of such candles not only among little women, but also among Bishops and the universal Church, as is clear from Paulinus, Theodoret, and others cited above.

Third, if it were superstition to light candles during the day before relics, it would also be superstition to light them when the Gospel is read and when the dead are carried to the tomb. But Jerome teaches in the same place against Vigilantius that it was customary to light candles for the Gospel throughout the entire East; and he teaches that they were lit at funerals in his Life of Paula, where he says that at Paula's funeral even Bishops carried lit candles.

To the Council of Elvira we responded when we were treating of Purgatory: that Council prohibited it because it was done in the manner of the Gentiles, among whom the Christians then lived, etc. Regarding Augustine, I say that he calls certain people "worshippers of tombs" who (as he thought) offered sacrifice of bread and wine and other foods to the spirits of the dead, and then gorged and intoxicated themselves with the same foods and wine. For he speaks thus: "I know," he says, "worshippers of tombs, I know there are many who drink most luxuriously over the dead and, exhibiting feasts to corpses, bury themselves over the buried, and reckon their gluttony and drunkenness as religion." But Augus-

tine wrote this at the beginning of his conversion. Afterwards, however, he reproved that custom, but not as idolatry; for in book 6 of the Confessions, chapter 2, he says his mother was accustomed to do this out of piety, but was prohibited by Ambrose's clerics in Milan. For Ambrose had prohibited that custom lest occasion be given to drunkenness, and because it seemed akin to the superstition of the Gentiles, although it was done by Christians with upright mind. The same Augustine also says in book 8 of The City of God, chapter 27, that better Christians do not do this, but those who do it do not sacrifice to the dead Martyrs, but place foods upon the tombs of Saints so that they may be sanctified by God through the merits of the Martyrs.

But that Augustine did not think it evil to venerate the tombs of Saints is clear from epistle 42 to the Madaurenses: "You see," he says, "the most eminent summit of the noblest empire supplicating at the tomb of the fisherman Peter with lowered diadem." And note that Augustine writes these things to idolaters to show that the worship of idols was destroyed by Christians. Moreover, when Augustine reproves worshippers of tombs, he certainly does not reprove Chrysostom and Jerome, but crowds of the ignorant. But Chrysostom in his sermon on Saints Juventius and Maximus says: "Let us adore the tombs of Martyrs"; and Jerome to Marcella, urging her to move to Bethlehem, says that the tombs and ashes of John the Baptist, Elisha, and Obadiah are worthily adored by the faithful in Palestine.

Gaudentius of Brescia, Ambrose's contemporary, in tract 4 on the Exodus of the Gullet, says: "For the sake of their own

throat, men first began to prepare meals for the dead, which they themselves would eat; after this they even dared to celebrate sacrilegious sacrifices to them, although they themselves sacrifice no less to their dead in parentalia (funeral rites), while pouring wines with hands trembling from drunkenness over the tables of tombs, they stammer forth the spirit," etc. Where he argues that custom as left over from the error of the Gentiles. Therefore perhaps some few sacrificed to the dead, who are also rightly reproved, but not therefore should all worship of sacred relics be abolished, because excessive worship was justly reproved.

To the fifth argument, we deny that relics which are publicly exposed in temples for veneration are false. For the Church has always carefully seen to it that frauds not be committed, and especially after the decree of the Lateran Council, that no relics be publicly received without the authority of the Roman Pontiff.

Regarding that statement of Augustine ("if however they were of Martyrs"), I say it is not surprising if Augustine doubted about relics which certain private individuals carried around. But we are treating of relics which are publicly preserved in temples. Regarding the matter of multiple bodies, I say that in various places there are parts of the same bodies, but the whole is named from the part; for, as Basil writes in his oration on the 40 Martyrs, all the 40 Martyrs were said to be then in various cities, because each city had a part of them. Theodoret also in book 3 On the Martyrs says that the bodies of Martyrs are rarely found complete in any one monument, but are divided and distributed to various places.

Finally, Saint John Chrysostom in his book That Christ is God says that the Apostle Peter lies both in Rome and in Constantinople, although in Constantinople there was nothing except some particle; for that the body itself is buried in Rome the same Chrysostom testifies in homily 32 on the epistle to the Romans. But let us hear his words from the book already cited: "In Rome," he says, "which is the most royal of cities, leaving all things behind, Kings and governors and soldiers run to the tombs of a fisherman and tent-maker; and in Constantinople our Kings consider it a great favor not if they are buried near the Apostles, but if even outside their vestibules their bodies are buried, and Kings become doorkeepers of fishermen."

CHAPTER FIVE
CONCERNING THE NAME OF IMAGE AND IDOL

There now follows in its proper order the disputation concerning the worship of images, of which disputation there will be eight parts. For first it must be said concerning the name of image, idol, and simulacrum. Second, who have been the enemies of images. Third, whether it is lawful to have images. Fourth, whether it is lawful to worship them. Fifth, with what worship they should be worshipped.

To these I will add a particular treatise on the cross, and indeed a threefold one. For first we will treat of the true Dominical cross. Second, of the permanent image of the cross. Third, of the transient image, that is, of the sign of the cross which we paint in the air.

Therefore, to begin from the name, Henry Stephanus in his thesaurus under the word εἴδωλον (eidolon), writes that among Ecclesiastical writers an idol is called every simulacrum representing some divinity, which we deem worthy of worship and honor. From which it follows that among Ecclesiastical writers the images of Christ and Saints, and especially images of the Trinity, are right-

ly called idols. And if indeed Henry means by Ecclesiastical writers his own Doctors—Calvin, Martyr, Illyricus and others of the same class—he speaks correctly, for they scarcely ever call our images anything other than idols. But if by Ecclesiastical writers he means the holy Fathers, or the Apostles and Prophets, what he says is most false; for in the first place the Seventh Synod, act 5 and act 7, pronounces anathema on those who call images of Christ and Saints idols. Then Origen in homily 8 on Exodus and Theodoret in question 38 on Exodus 20: "You shall not make for yourself a graven image" (which the Septuagint translated as εἴδωλον) "and every likeness," etc. [1] They say there is this difference between image and idol: that an image is a true likeness of a thing, as when we paint a man, a horse, etc. For image is said from imitating. But an idol is a false likeness, that is, a representation of what does not really exist, as when the Gentiles set up statues of Venus or Minerva. Those signs were idols because they represented Gods of feminine gender, such as Gods neither are nor can be. And thus they truly represented, but they were false images. For that which does not exist cannot be represented. From which we understand that images of Christ and Saints are not idols. But neither are images of the Trinity or Angels idols, because they are not made to represent the nature of the Trinity or Angels, but to express the form in which they appeared, or certainly their properties, as we shall say below.

That this is the true difference of those words according to Ecclesiastical writers is proven first, because Scripture nowhere at-

[1] Exod. XX. 4.

tributes the name of idol to any true image, but only to simulacra of the Gentiles, which referred to false Gods. Scripture calls the Son of God the image of the Father, Wisdom 7, Colossians 1, and Hebrews 1, but never calls him the idol of the Father; and in 3 Kings 7 it is said that Solomon made for the ornament of the temple images of Cherubim in the likeness of men; likewise images of lions, oxen, palms, pomegranates, flowers, etc., and these are never called idols, because they were likenesses of true things.

Second, because the Scripture of the Old Testament ordinarily calls idols אליל (elil), as in Leviticus 19, 26 and elsewhere, or אובים (obim), as in Numbers 23, Hosea 6 and elsewhere. Moreover, אליל (elil) signifies vain, false; and אובים similarly signifies vanity, falsehood; sometimes it also calls them שקר (sheqer), that is, lies, as Jerome notes in chapter 7 of Hosea, where you always see that idol signifies something false. Finally, Habakkuk 2 says: "What does a graven image profit, since its maker has carved it, a molten image and a teacher of lies?" [2] where an idol is most clearly defined as a false image. Similar to this is what Plato says in the Theaetetus, when he says: ψεύδη καὶ εἴδωλα περὶ πλείονος ποιησάμενοι τοῦ ἀληθῶς (pseudē kai eidōla peri pleionos poiēsamenoi tou alēthōs), that is, "they make lies and idols of more account than truth," where he joined idol with lies and opposed it to truth.

Third, because blessed Paul in 1 Corinthians 8 says: "We know that an idol is nothing in the world." Where an idol is said to be nothing, because although it is something according to matter, yet it is nothing formally, since it represents what is nothing, and

[2] Habak. II. 18.

therefore does not truly represent, and consequently is not. To which passage Jerome adduces another similar one in chapter 7 of Hosea to prove that an idol is nothing; for in Esther 14 it is said: "Do not deliver your scepter to those who are not" [3], that is, to idols.

Fourth, because blessed Jerome in chapter 2 of Habakkuk and in chapter 13 of Zechariah and elsewhere throughout compares heresies with idols, because as an idol is a false image, so heresy is a false imagination.

Fifth, from the very property of the word; for (as Tertullian teaches in his book On Idolatry) idol is a diminutive from εἶδος (eidos), that is, form, and signifies a small form, not in quantity alone, but in perfection. For properly an idol is (as Eustathius explains in book 2 of the Odyssey) an empty image, such as is seen in the shadow of a man, and such as are phantasms, that is, images which we fabricate by imagination, to which often nothing corresponds in reality; and such finally as are specters and shades of the dead, which indeed seem to be something solid, but are empty. Hence Homer in book 11 of the Odyssey, and Lucian in his Dialogue of the Dead, call the souls of the dead εἴδωλα (eidōla); and Virgil in book 6 of the Aeneid seems to have wished to explain the same thing when he says:

"Here Aeneas, seized with sudden fear, grasps his sword
And offers the drawn blade to those approaching: And, had not his
learned companion warned him That thin lives flit about bodiless

[3] I. Cor. VIII, 4; Esther. XIV, 11.

under hollow semblance of form, He would rush forward and vainly cleave shadows with steel."

Where what Homer and Lucian call εἴδωλα (eidōla), he himself calls shadows and hollow images, that is, vain and empty ones. Since therefore idol in its proper and primary signification designates an empty image, thence sacred writers and Ecclesiastical Doctors called idols the statues of false Gods, although they are solid as to matter, because they are empty as to form, that is, as to representation. These things concerning the name of idol.

The name of simulacrum is indeed somewhat more common; for Lactantius in book 6 On True Worship, chapters 10 and 13, calls man the simulacrum of God; and in book 2 On the Origin of Error, chapter 2, he says simulacrum is called from similitude, and therefore every true image can be called a simulacrum. More truly, however, is what others say, that simulacrum is called from simulating, not from similitude; for in the Scriptures simulacra are everywhere put for idols. For always where the Latin interpreter put simulacra, as in Acts 15, Psalm 113, 1 John last chapter, and elsewhere, always in the Greek there is εἴδωλα (eidōla); and blessed Augustine in Psalm 135 says that the Latins call those simulacra which by the Greeks are called idols. Jerome too in chapter 7 of Hosea says that simulacrum is thus opposed to God as a lie is opposed to truth, because a simulacrum refers to a false God.

Finally, just as Homer and Lucian call idols the shades of the dead, which seem to be certain solid bodies and are not, so also Lucretius in book 4 and Virgil in book 4 of the Georgics and book

6 of the Aeneid everywhere call the same shades of the dead simulacra.

CHAPTER SIX
ON THE LEADERS OF THE ICONOCLASTS

The authors of iconoclasm were all either Jews, Mohammedans, Magi, or manifest heretics, such that those who oppose images at this time cannot deny that their ancestors and forebears were impious.

Alphonsus de Castro, under the word "Image," attributes this error to a certain Felix, whom he says was condemned in the Council of Francia, as witnessed by Platina in his work on Adrian I, yet he cannot discover who this Felix was. He also attributes it to Serenus, Bishop of Marseilles, whom Blessed Gregory reproves in book VII, epistle 109, and book IX, epistle 9. Finally, the same Alphonsus attributes this error to Blessed Epiphanius in his epistle to John of Jerusalem.

But none of these, with Alphonsus's permission, was involved in this error. For the Felix condemned in the Synod of Frankfurt is Felix, Bishop of Urgel. He, however (as is clear from Ado in his Chronicle and Jonas in book I), only taught that Christ was the adoptive Son of God. Yet because the same synod at the same time rejected (as is clear from the same Ado in his Chronicle

for the year 792) the pseudo-synod of the Greeks against images, both Platina and Alphonsus thought that the Felician heresy was the heresy of the iconoclasts. But Serenus indeed broke images, yet is by no means to be numbered among the iconoclastic heretics. For he broke images because he saw them being adored as gods by Christians who were recently converted. Hence Blessed Gregory praises his zeal and faith, and only reproves his rashness in that he dared to do what no bishop had ever done before, and he admonishes him to instruct the people why images are maintained by the Church, and after providing instruction, to allow images to be restored in the temples. Nor was it necessary for Castro to say that Serenus and Epiphanius were excused from heresy because the matter had not yet been determined. For the matter was sufficiently determined by the practice of the entire Church. But these men did or taught nothing against faith or truth. And especially Epiphanius, who is cleared of all suspicion of error concerning images in the VII Synod, act. 6, and we shall deal with this matter below. And certainly not without rashness and prejudice to the Catholic faith are such gross errors attributed to such great men.

Nicholas Sanderus in book I, final chapter, on images, says that the first iconoclasts were Manicheans, both because Tharasius seems to indicate this in the VII Synod, and also because Faustus, in Augustine book XX, chapter 3, against Faustus, boasts that God is worshiped without images by men of his sect. But whether the matter stands thus, I strongly doubt. For Tharasius in the VII Synod, act. 5, does not say that the Manicheans rejected images, but says that the iconoclasts, while they reject images, are similar to the

Manicheans who asserted that Christ did not have a true body; for he who denies that Christ can be depicted seems to think that Christ does not have a true body. Moreover, Faustus in Augustine does not speak of images of saints, but only of images of God. Hence neither does Faustus in that place reprove the Manicheans for lacking images and the Catholics for having images, nor does Augustine reprove them.

Therefore, the first iconoclasts are the Jews, who in their Talmud, which appeared in the year of Christ 476, order II, tract. 1, dist. 2, expressly teach that the churches of Christians are houses of idolatry, which is clearly said on account of images, both from the VII Synod, where iconoclasts are frequently called Hebrews, and from the Dialogues of Leontius, where a Jew disputes with a Christian about images. Part of these Dialogues is contained in the VII Synod, act. 5.

Around the same time, under the reign of Zeno, there arose Xenaias, whom Nicephorus in book XVI, chapter 27, and Cedrenus in his compendium say was a leader of the iconoclasts. This Xenaias was a Persian man and a barbarian, indeed even a fugitive slave, and although he was not baptized, yet feigning himself to be a Christian, he crept into the episcopate. But although he openly urged that images should not be venerated, we do not read that he persuaded anyone except perhaps a few.

But after nearly a hundred years, under the Emperor Justin the Younger, certain Samaritans burst into a church and most ferociously attacked the images of Christ and the saints, as is clear from

the epistle of Simon the Hermit to the Emperor Justin, which is contained in the VII Synod, act. 5.

Not long after, after the year of the Lord 600, Mohammed arose, who permitted no images in temples for the men of his sect, as is clear from the Koran, chapters 15 and 17, and from experience itself. For the Turks do not have images and consider us idolaters on account of the worship of images.

Again, after nearly a hundred years, that is, after the year 700 of the Lord, a certain Hebrew sorcerer promised Ezid, King of the Arabs and a Mohammedan, thirty years of life if he would order the images of Christ and the saints to be removed from Christian churches in his empire and burned. He commanded it, but when the Christians did not obey, he sent Arabs and Hebrews into the churches, who diligently completed the task. But King Ezides died the following year, and the Hebrew, as an impostor, was forced to die a most shameful death by his successor. The story is narrated in the VII Synod, act. 5, and also by Cedrenus, Zonaras, and Nicetas in the life of Leo the Isaurian.

Shortly after, the Emperor Leo the Isaurian, similarly persuaded by the Jews, by public edict ordered images to be removed and destroyed from all temples. And he put many resisting Christians to death, whence he acquired the name of iconoclast. The authorities are Cedrenus, Zonaras, Paul the Deacon, and others. And this was the first of the Christians who waged war against images. For although Philippicus, according to Paul the Deacon, had removed the images of the six synods, he had done this from ha-

tred of the sixth synod, not from hatred of images. For Philippicus was a Monothelite, not an iconoclast.

Whether Leo acted rightly or wrongly can be discerned from the fact that in this matter he preferred to adhere to the counsels of wicked Jews rather than to Saint Gregory the Pope and Saint Germanus, Patriarch of Constantinople, who were then seated and openly resisted the Emperor, as is clear from the same authorities. That Gregory and Germanus were excellent and most learned pontiffs is transmitted by all the historians of that time, both Greek and Latin. Twelve wise men also resisted Leo, who with their superior, who was called the Ecumenical Master, were supported at public expense and were the best and wisest of all. Leo burned them together with their house and most well-stocked library. See Zonaras in the life of this Leo.

Moreover, the impiety of Leo was followed by Constantine Copronymus, son of this Leo, who, as a sign of future wickedness, defiled the sacred font with dung while being baptized. And moreover, he was a necromancer and a Nestorian heretic, for he did not believe that Blessed Mary was the Mother of God (Theotokos), as can be known from Zonaras and Cedrenus.

Sanderus rightly warns that William Xylander did not faithfully translate Cedrenus's words in this story. For where Cedrenus wrote that this Constantine exacted an oath from all his subjects by which they would confirm that they would not worship any image, those words εικόνι μη προσκυνήσαι τινὶ (not to worship any image), he translates as "that they would not supplicate to any simulacrum," as if Christians supplicate to idols. Yet it is estab-

lished, as we have already shown, that images are not rightly called simulacra, and Christian practice maintains that we venerate images, not that we supplicate to them as if they were living and sentient. But surely one who has no faith in God, it is no wonder if he also does not keep faith in translating books.

After the year 800, when the war against images had been quiet for some time, it was renewed again by Leo the Armenian, Emperor, and those who succeeded him, Michael the Stammerer and Theophilus, all of whom Cedrenus and Zonaras testify in their lives were most wicked, the last also being addicted to the Jewish sect and necromancy.

At the same time that Theophilus was attacking images in the East, there arose in the West under the Empire of Louis the Pious, son of Charlemagne, Claudius of Spain, Bishop of Turin, a disciple of Felix of Urgel, who removed all images and crosses from all the temples of his diocese. He was an ignorant and proud man, as appears from his treatise inserted in the books of Jonas, and he attempted to bring back to light the Arian heresy, already buried.

After those times, around the year of the Lord 1372, there arose John Wycliffe, who briefly touched upon the censure of images, but his disciples afterward more sharply attacked images. See Thomas of Wales, volume III, title 49. Claudius Coussorius attributes the same error to the Waldensians in his book against the Waldensians, final article.

John Cochlaeus also writes in book III of his history of the Hussites that an image of the crucified Christ was cast down and

defiled with dung by Jerome of Prague, although he himself adored in his room an image of Wycliffe crowned with a diadem.

Finally, in this our age, the first who removed images from temples was Andreas Carlstadt in the year 1522, as witnessed by John Cochlaeus in his life of Luther. Luther, although he approved the deed, nevertheless reproved the author, as Cochlaeus says in the same place, because he had not sought power and authority from him to do this. Cochlaeus also writes that the Zwinglians fought against images in the acts of Luther for the year 1526. Philip also, in his common places explaining the decalogue, reproves the veneration of images. Similarly, the Magdeburg Centuriators throughout Century VIII, but especially in chapters 9 and 10.

Finally, John Calvin in book I, chapter 11, and book IV, chapter 9, § 9 of the Institutes most sharply reproves the worship of images, and the Calvinists, wherever they can, break, burn, or scrape them away.

CHAPTER SEVEN
THAT IT IS LAWFUL BOTH TO MAKE AND TO HAVE IMAGES

With these things having been set forth, in order to show that the use of images is lawful for Christians, we shall propose and refute various errors that have arisen concerning this matter. The first indeed is that of the Jews, who once were most inclined toward idolatry, but after Christ's advent are most superstitious against images. For they say that it is prohibited by divine law to make any images whatsoever, as witnessed by Paul of Burgos, addition 2 to Lyra on chapter XX of Exodus, which the same thing the Wycliffites teach according to Waldensis, volume III, title 19, chapter 152. Their reasoning is that in Exodus XX it is said: "You shall not make for yourself a graven image, nor any likeness," etc. [1]

However, this is a manifest error. And without doubt, not every image is prohibited in the decalogue, but only that which can be called an idol, that is, an image which is held as God, or which represents as God that thing which is not God. For when it is said "You shall not have other gods," the interior act of idolatry is pro-

[1] Exod. XX, 4.

hibited; when it is added "You shall not make for yourself a graven image," etc., the exterior act is prohibited. See Augustine, question 71 on Exodus.

This opinion is proved first because if every image were prohibited, it would follow that the precepts of the decalogue are not only 10, but 11 or 12, contrary to Scripture, which says there are 10, Exodus XXXI and XXXIV, Deuteronomy IV, IX, and X. For it is established that one precept is "You shall not have other gods." Another: "You shall not take the name of God in vain." 3. "Keep the Sabbaths holy." 4. "Honor your parents." 5. "You shall not kill." 6. "You shall not commit adultery." 7. "You shall not steal." 8. "You shall not bear false witness." 9. "You shall not covet." These nine are without controversy distinct.

Moreover, that "You shall not covet" must either be divided into two, so that the ninth is "you shall not covet another's wife," and the tenth "you shall not covet another's thing," or all these belong to one. If it must be divided into two, then "You shall not make for yourself a graven image" will be the eleventh, or it must be said that this is not a precept distinct from the first, as indeed Clement of Alexandria in book VI of the Stromata, Augustine in question 71 on Exodus and epistle 119, chapter 11, and commonly the Scholastics in III Sentences, distinction 37, and all Latin catechisms say. And then not any graven image whatsoever is prohibited, but only a graven image which is held as another god.

But if "You shall not covet" is only one, as Philo thinks in his book on the decalogue before the middle, Josephus in book III of Antiquities, chapters 6 and 8, Origen in homily 8 on Exodus,

Ambrose and Jerome on chapter VI to the Ephesians, Procopius and Rupert on chapter XX of Exodus think, then all those words will be one precept: "You shall not make for yourself a graven image," etc., "and you shall not adore them, nor serve them." But making images absolutely and adoring the same are distinct things, as is clear, because one can adore a graven image that he did not make, and another may not adore what he made. Therefore, only one of these is prohibited; otherwise there would be eleven precepts. But it is certain that worship is prohibited; therefore, fabrication is not prohibited per se, but only in relation to worship. Hence, he sins who makes in order to adore, not he who makes for another use.

Second, it is proved that images are not prohibited absolutely by divine law from the fact that in Scripture itself we read of images made by God's command. Indeed, in Exodus XXV, God commanded images of Cherubim to be made above the ark. In Numbers XXI, the bronze serpent. In III Kings VI and VII, Cherubim, oxen, lions, and other things. The Jews respond that God commanded men, not himself. Moreover, he commanded the images of the temple to be made just as he prohibited theft, and yet he commanded that the Jews should despoil Egypt, Exodus XII.

But on the contrary. First, the precepts of the decalogue are explanations of the law of nature, except that about the Sabbath. But things prohibited by natural law are prohibited because they are evil, not evil because prohibited, and therefore cannot be commanded even by God. Nor did God ever command theft, but as Lord he gave the goods of the Egyptians to the Jews as a gift.

Then, if images were prohibited, it would certainly be on account of the danger of idolatry. But the same danger exists if God commands them to be made, indeed greater, insofar as they are held more divine, as happened with the bronze serpent, IV Kings XVIII. Therefore, God did not prohibit images absolutely.

It is proved third because that is never understood to be prohibited which in no way opposes the end of the law. But the end of the precepts of the first table is that God's honor be preserved inviolate, as is clear from the beginning of the decalogue: "I am the Lord your God." Also from that threat: "I am a jealous God." Also from that explanation, Exodus XX: "You shall not make with me gods of gold and gods of silver." Also from Leviticus XXVI: "You shall not make graven images and idols to adore." Finally from that of Isaiah XLII: "I am the Lord; I will not give my glory to another, and my praise to graven images" (2). But an image not made for veneration does not oppose the honor of God. Therefore it is not prohibited.

You will say: An image is an occasion of idolatry. I respond that the sun, moon, and many other things are also such, but accidentally.

Fourth, the art of painting and sculpting is good and from God, as is clear from Exodus XXXI and XXXV, where it is said that God gave to two men, Bezalel and Oholiab, his spirit, wisdom, and knowledge for sculpting and devising many things for the ornament of the tabernacle.

---

2 Exod. XX, 2, 5 et 23; Levit. XXVI, 1; Isai. XLII, 8.

Fifth, God is the first author of all images, natural and artificial, for he begot his Son in his image and formed man in his image.

Sixth, an image is according to nature and necessary. For first, all natural things produce something like themselves, that is, an image of themselves. Man, whatever he knows whether by sense or intellect, knows through images. We cannot be in light without our bodies making a shadow, which is an image of the body. All clothes are images of those members for covering which they were made.

Finally, the Jews at the time of Christ had the image of Caesar on coins, as is clear from Matthew XXII, and now they also retain images of princes on money. Why therefore do they say it is not lawful to have any image? Certainly if someone wished to take away from them the images which they have on coins and hangings, they would immediately change their opinion.

The second opinion is that of Ambrose Catharinus in his treatise on images, where he teaches that God in the decalogue prohibited images simply, but that precept was positive and temporal. For he thinks that God therefore commanded images of Cherubim to be made to indicate that images are not evil per se, but only evil because prohibited, and also lest prejudice be caused to the New Testament, in which images were to be permitted.

But this opinion is not approved by us, both on account of the arguments made against the Jews, and also because Saint Irenaeus in book IV, chapters 31 and 32, expressly teaches that the decalogue is the natural law, except for the precept about the Sab-

bath. And Tertullian in his entire book on idolatry contends that this precept is now especially to be observed. The same thing Blessed Cyprian teaches in book III to Quirinus, chapter 59, and in his work on the exhortation to martyrdom, chapter I. Blessed Augustine everywhere affirms that the entire decalogue, except the law about the Sabbath, is to be kept by Christians, and specifically that "You shall not make for yourself a graven image." See book XV against Faustus, chapters 4 and 7, and book XIX, chapter 18, book III against the second epistle of the Pelagians, chapter 4. The same Blessed Thomas has in 2.2, question CXXII, articles 1 and 4. Therefore, if all images were prohibited in the decalogue, Christians having images would sin.

You will say that in the decalogue the precept of the Sabbath is positive at least in part; therefore nothing prevents the precept about images from also being positive in part. I respond that in the precept of the Sabbath many things are placed which indicate that it is positive. For first, "Remember" is prefixed, because since it is not a natural precept, the Jews could easily forget it. Second, the reason for the precept is added: "Because the Lord rested from work on the seventh day." But no reason is added to any other precept because the rest are simply natural. Finally, Irenaeus, Augustine, and Thomas expressly except only the Sabbath from the natural precepts of the decalogue.

The third opinion is that of Thomas Cajetan on chapter XX of Exodus, who teaches that it is not prohibited to make any image or idol, but only prohibited that anyone make for himself an image which he wishes to have as his God; and he proves this be-

cause it is not said "You shall not make a graven image," but "You shall not make for yourself a graven image."

This opinion displeases only in its manner of speaking, for Cajetan considers idol and image as the same, when this is false, as we showed above. Then he seems to concede that it is lawful to make idols which are held as gods, provided that he who makes them does not hold them as gods. But Tertullian in his entire book on idolatry proves with most evident reasons that it is prohibited for Christian painters or sculptors to make idols for the Gentiles. And the Church celebrates on November 8 the martyrdom of Saints Claudius, Nicostratus, and their companions, who were killed because they refused to make images for the Gentiles, though they were most skilled sculptors.

Nor would Cajetan deny this, since in 2.2, question X, article 4, he teaches that it is not lawful to sell idols to the Gentiles. Therefore he spoke incautiously in his commentary on Exodus. Nor does that particle "for yourself" present an obstacle, for according to Hebrew idiom it is redundant, as in Genesis XII: "Go for yourself from your land," and throughout the Song of Songs.

CHAPTER EIGTH
IMAGES OF GOD ARE NOT PROHIBITED

The fourth opinion is that of Calvin in Book V of the Institutes, chapter 11, where he says: First, that it is impious to place a visible and corporeal image of the invisible and incorporeal God. Second, that images of Christ and the Saints are not prohibited absolutely, but ought not to be placed in temples. Third, that painted histories have some use for instruction; but mere images of Christ or the Saints without any notation of deeds accomplished have no use except for pleasure, and therefore are made in vain. Therefore, to begin with the first point, Calvin proves that an image of God cannot be painted.

First, because in Exodus XX all likeness of God is prohibited; for after Scripture had said: "You shall not make for yourself a graven image, nor any likeness," it adds below, explaining: "Gods of gold and silver you shall not make with me," that is, you shall not make golden or silver images that represent God. And in Deuteronomy IV: "Remember that the Lord spoke to you on Mount Horeb, you heard the voice of words, you saw no image, therefore observe yourself lest perhaps deceived you make for your-

self any likeness." And in Isaiah XL: "To whom have you made God similar? Or what image will you set for him?" And in chapter XLVI: "To whom have you likened me, and made equal, and compared me, and made similar? Who gather gold from the purse, and weigh silver in the balance, hiring a goldsmith to make a god." Finally in Acts XVII, Paul says: "Since therefore we are the offspring of God, it ought not to be thought that the divine is like gold, or silver, or stone, a work of art and human thought." [1]

Second, he proves from the Council of Elvira, canon 36: "It has been decided that there should be no pictures in temples, lest what is worshipped or adored be painted on walls." Where it is clear that this concerns images of God, who alone is worshipped and adored by Christians.

Third, he proves the same from the Fathers: for Eusebius in Book I of the Preparation for the Gospel, chapter 6, and Book II, chapter 8, and Lactantius in Book I of the Divine Institutions, chapter 15, write that all those whose statues we see were mortal men: therefore there was no statue of the true immortal God. Likewise Augustine in On Faith and the Symbol, chapter 7, says it is impious to place statues for God. Moreover, the same Augustine in Book IV of the City of God, chapters 19 and 31, reports Varro saying that those who first introduced statues of the gods both removed fear and added error. And in Book VI, chapter 10, he reports Seneca's complaint, who grieved that inviolable gods were dedicated in the vilest and most ignoble matter.

---

[1] Exod. XXII, 4 et 5; Jud. XVIII, 3.

He could also have added Origen in Book VII Against Celsus, at the end, and John Damascene in Book IV On Faith, chapter 17, who teach that Christians have no image of God, as one who is incorporeal and invisible. Finally, the Fathers of the VII Synod, acts 4, 5, and 6, who say that Christ is rightly painted because he is man: but God cannot be painted.

Fourth, he proves from the danger of error: for although St. Gregory wrote that images are the books of the unlearned, yet on the contrary Scripture calls a wooden image "a doctrine of vanities" in Jeremiah X, and a molten image "a teacher of lies" in Habakkuk II. "Therefore," says Calvin, "if Gregory had been taught in the school of the Spirit, he would never have said that an image is the book of the unlearned."

Fifth, by reason, because it does not seem possible to make a true corporeal image of an incorporeal thing. Add also that images are made of absent things, but God is present everywhere.

This opinion of Calvin is also held by some Catholics, such as Abulensis on chapter IV of Deuteronomy, question 5, Durandus in III, distinction 9, question 2, and Peresius in On Traditions, part 3, in the treatise on images; who teach that an image of God is not rightly made, and is perhaps tolerated by the Church, but not approved.

I say three things: First, it is not as certain in the Church whether images of God or the Trinity should be made as it is for Christ and the Saints; for all Catholics confess the latter, and it pertains to faith, while the former is a matter of opinion. Second, Calvin's fraud and cunning is remarkable, who after he proved that

images of God ought not to be made, so digresses to amplifications and sings triumph, as if he had proved that it is not lawful to venerate or make any image. Third, I say that it is lawful to paint even an image of God the Father in the form of an old man, and of the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove, as Cajetan teaches in 3rd part, question XXV, article 3, Ambrose Catharinus in his book On the Veneration of Images, Diego Payva in his last book Against Chemnitz, Nicholas Sander in his work On the Veneration of Images, Thomas Waldensis, tome III, title 19, chapter 155. We prove this as follows.

First, angels are incorporeal, and yet they were depicted and sculpted in the Old Testament, Exodus XXV, III Kings VI. Therefore God also, although incorporeal, can be painted.

Calvin responds that this was done for the pedagogy of the old law, but now that childish age has passed. But we do not ask for what purpose they were made, but we dispute that an incorporeal thing can be painted: and just as angels are painted for the pedagogy of the people, why cannot God be painted for the pedagogy of the people? For although that age has passed which could be called childish in respect to ours, yet ours too can be called childish in respect to the future age in heaven.

Second, God was seen in corporeal appearance; for he appeared to Adam as a man walking in paradise in the breeze after midday, Genesis III. Jacob saw God leaning on the top of the ladder, and therefore in corporeal form, Genesis XXVIII. Moses saw the back parts of God, that is, his back and shoulders, Exodus XXXIII. Isaiah chapter VI and Micah III Kings last saw the Lord

sitting on a throne in the form of a king-man. And Amos chapter IX saw the Lord standing upon the altar. Finally Daniel chapter VII saw him sitting on a throne, and describes his head and his hair as white, and his garments as white. The Holy Spirit appeared in the form of a dove, Matthew III. Finally angels appeared very frequently in human form, Genesis XVIII and XIX, in the book of Tobias. They were also seen with others, as in Isaiah VI and Daniel IX, and in white robes, Matthew last, Luke last, and John XX. What therefore prohibits painting them thus?

Calvin responds that God's sometimes showing himself in human form was a prelude to the incarnation, but the dove suddenly vanished to indicate that the Holy Spirit is invisible. But what is the point of this? For we do not ask for what end or how long God appeared in corporeal form, but we contend that God can be painted in that form in which he showed himself. And moreover it is not true that the appearance of God in human form was always a prelude to the incarnation; for sometimes God the Father or the Holy Spirit appeared, who nevertheless were not to be incarnated. Blessed Augustine in Book XX of the Trinity, chapter 11, thinks that in those three men who appeared to Abraham, Genesis XVIII, the three persons of the Trinity appeared: and in the same book, in the last chapter, he proves that the person of the Father was seen in human form, from Daniel chapter VII. For there we read that the Ancient of Days was seen on a throne, who gave the kingdom to the Son of Man, that is, to Christ; and yet neither the whole Trinity nor God the Father was to be incarnated.

Third, Scripture in words attributes to God all human members, when it says he stands, sits, walks; it names his head, feet, arms; it attributes to him a seat, throne, footstool, etc. Why therefore cannot painting exhibit what Scripture depicts?

They respond that Scripture therefore without danger attributes members to God, because elsewhere the same Scripture says that God is incorporeal. But why, I ask, cannot the same Scripture prevent the error of painting? For just as we learn from Scripture that the members which are attributed to God in Scripture itself are to be taken metaphorically, so also we learn from the same that the members which are attributed to God in painting are to be taken metaphorically. And the unlearned, who see paintings and cannot read the Scriptures, can and ought to be instructed by prelates and preachers, as the Council of Trent admonishes, session XXV. Otherwise I confess that such paintings are not without danger when exhibited to the ignorant. For here we only defend that such images are not to be condemned universally.

Fourth, things are painted which seem less able to be painted than God, namely virtues, which are not only spiritual but also accidents; why therefore cannot God be painted?

Fifth, man is the true image of God; but an image of man can be painted, therefore also of God; for what is the image of an image is also of the exemplar; for things that are similar to a third thing are also similar to each other.

They will say that man is not the image of God in the part that is painted, that is, the body, but in the part that cannot be painted, that is, the soul. I respond that if it were so, it would follow

that man cannot be depicted; for man is not man by reason of figure and colors, which alone are expressed in an image, but is man by reason of substance, and especially by reason of the soul, which cannot be painted. Yet man is said to be truly and properly depicted, because the figure and colors of the image represent not only the figure and colors of man, but the whole man himself; otherwise it would never happen that the thing depicted would seem to be the true thing itself. Which nevertheless happened to the grapes which Zeuxis had painted, to pluck which little birds ran up, as Pliny testifies in Book XXXV, chapter 10.

Therefore, although man is in the image of God by reason of intellect and will, nevertheless the whole man as understanding and willing is rightly said to be and is the image of God; for in Genesis I God does not say: "Let us make a soul," but "Let us make man in the image of God." And when a certain emperor was raging against those who had broken an image of his wife, St. Macedonius said to him (as Theodoret reports in the Religious History, chapter 43) that he was acting badly, because for the sake of his own images he was killing God's images. And yet the emperor was killing not souls but men. But if the whole man is the image of God, and the whole man is truly painted, therefore the image of God is truly painted. This however is true, that just as man is a very imperfect, obscure, and dissimilar image of God, so also painted man is a very imperfect, obscure, and dissimilar image of God.

Finally it is proved from the usage of the Church. For such images are now received almost everywhere; nor is it credible that the Church would universally tolerate anything illicit. Add that the

VII Council, act 5, approves the image of the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove, and the Council of Trent, session XXV, admits images of God especially in paintings of histories.

For the solution of arguments it should be observed that something can be painted in three ways. In one way to express the perfect likeness of form and nature of the thing itself, and in this way only corporeal things are painted, insofar as they are endowed with lines and colors. And if anyone should attempt to paint God in this way, he would constitute a true idol.

In another way to exhibit some history to the eyes; in which way if someone wanted to paint the expulsion of Adam from Paradise, he would have to paint God in the form of a man walking, and Adam and Eve naked hiding among the trees, and finally an angel in human form bearing a sword and expelling Adam with his wife. But one who painted thus would certainly not want to represent the nature of God or the angel, but only to exhibit to the eyes through painting what another would exhibit to the ears by reciting Scripture, and in this way God can be painted.

Third, something can be painted outside of history to explain the nature of a thing not through immediate and proper likeness, but through analogy, or metaphorical and mystical significations. Just as we paint angels as youths, winged, beautiful, with bare feet, etc., to signify that they always abound in strength, move most swiftly, are endowed with the splendor of grace and virtues, etc., which see in Dionysius, last chapter of the Celestial Hierarchy. In this way also virtues are painted. And man himself, the image of God, is of this third kind. For there is no other likeness between

man and God than analogical. In this way we paint God the Father, when we paint him outside of history in human form.

In this way we paint Christ in the form of a sheep, and we represent the Evangelists through an eagle, lion, ox, and man, and the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove or tongues of fire. Where however it should be noted that such images ought not to be multiplied, nor should it be tolerated that painters dare to devise images of the Trinity from their own head: as when they paint one man with three faces, or one man with two heads, and a dove in the middle of them; for these seem to be certain monstrosities, and offend more by their deformity than they help by their likeness. Whence also the Hungarian Ministers in their work Against the Trinity, Book 1, chapter 4, have collected many forms of images of the Trinity, and propose them as certain monstrosities carefully depicted for ridicule, and call them Cerberuses, Geryons, three-fronted Januses, monsters and idols, to which certainly our painters have given occasion for blaspheming.

Moreover it should be noted that Bartholomew Carranza errs, who in his Summary of Councils says that canon 82 of the sixth Synod prohibits the image of Christ in the form of a lamb, and of the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove. But the Council does not prohibit these images, but only prefers to these the images of Christ in human form.

Whence in the VII Synod, act 2, is read the letter of Adrian to Tarasius, in which the image of Christ in the form of a lamb is said to be praised in the VI Synod. The same says Elias in the VII Synod, action 4. The same Epiphanius in the VII Synod, act 6.

And moreover in the VII Synod, act 5, the image of the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove is approved.

Moreover Bartholomew's reason seems to conclude against himself; for he says these images were prohibited because figures ought to cease when truth is present. But these images were not in use in the Old Testament, but began after Christ's advent. For the image of the lamb took occasion from those words of John: "Behold the Lamb of God"; but the image of the dove from that dove which appeared over Christ, Matthew III. This author seems to have taken occasion for error from the canon itself, which is not had complete in that Synod, but the error should be corrected from the VII Synod, where very often this same canon is adduced complete.

From these things it will be easy to respond to the arguments of adversaries. To the first it could be said in one word that in all the cited Scriptures the image of God of the first kind is prohibited. I think however that in Exodus XX when it says: "Gods of gold and gods of silver you shall not make with me," and similarly in Isaiah XL and XLVI, where God complains saying: "To whom have you likened me?" it does not deal literally with an image made to represent the true God, for such were not made by the Jews, but with any statues whatsoever that were held as gods. For God wants to say: if a wooden statue is god to you, since I too am God, it follows that I am similar to a wooden god according to you; for God could not but be similar to God.

To the second I say, if that Council speaks of the image of God alone (as Calvin wants), there is no difficulty; for we will un-

derstand the Council concerning the image of God of the first kind. But if the Council speaks of all images, even of Saints, there is greater difficulty, concerning which below.

To the third, Eusebius and Lactantius speak of the idols of the Gentiles. For they want to show that the gods of the Gentiles were men, and they prove it because all the idols of the Gentiles are statues of men, whose tombs are also shown. Augustine in On Faith and the Symbol speaks of the image of God of the first kind. Varro in Augustine rightly says that those who introduced statues of gods both removed fear and added error; for some therefore believed that the statues themselves were gods, and seeing that they neither helped nor harmed others or themselves, they began to despise the gods. But if they had believed that they were not gods but images of gods, and not proper but analogical images, they would neither have lost fear nor found error, just as fear of princes is not diminished, nor does any error arise through their images, which we see daily. Seneca in the same Augustine complains that statues are placed for gods because of the same error, because the statues themselves were thought to be gods, or certainly the gods were judged similar to those statues. Origen and Damascene and the Nicene Fathers speak of the image of God of the first kind.

To the fourth I say: First, that Blessed Gregory is unjustly reproached by Calvin; for Blessed Gregory, when he says that pictures are the books of the unlearned, does not deal with the image of God, but with images of Saints, and especially with painted histories in which the mysteries of redemption are contained. But the Prophets, whom Calvin opposes to Gregory, when they say that

wood is a teacher of vanities or lies, speak of statues of false gods, not of true images of Saints.

I say second, that idols are indeed teachers of lies, because they want to seem to be gods; or certainly they seem to bear the likeness of gods when they truly do not bear it. But the image of God and the Trinity, as painted by us, is a teacher of truth, because it is neither held as God by us, nor is it made to bear God's likeness, but to lead man into some knowledge of God through analogical likenesses.

To the fifth, we have already shown how an incorporeal thing can be painted.

To the last, absent things are usually painted because they are not seen: but God, although he is present, is nevertheless not seen, therefore he can be painted as if he were absent. Otherwise it would not be necessary to pray to God with an external voice; for voices are for those who do not perceive thoughts, but God searches the reins and hearts.

CHAPTER NINE
IMAGES ARE RIGHTLY PLACED IN TEMPLES

Calvin's second assertion, that images ought not to be placed in temples, he proves in Book I of the Institutes, chapter XI. First, because in the first five hundred years there were no images in Christian temples.

Second, because the Council of Elvira, canon 36, prohibits pictures from being made in temples.

Third, because an image cannot be placed in a temple, in a sublime place, without immediately erecting a certain sign of idolatry. For as Blessed Augustine says in letter 49: "When they are placed in these seats with honorable sublimity, so that they are attended by those praying and sacrificing, by the very likeness of animate members and senses, although they lack sense and soul, they affect weak minds so that they seem to live and breathe." Likewise in Psalm CXIII: "For this makes and somehow extorts that figure of members, so that the mind living in the body rather judges that the body which it sees most similar to itself has feeling," etc. And a little later: "Statues are more powerful for corrupting the unhappy soul, because they have mouth, eyes, ears, feet, than for correcting,

because they do not speak, nor see, nor hear, nor walk." There Augustine says that in Christian temples there are indeed golden and silver vessels, but not such as have a mouth and do not speak. He also confirms from I John, last, where John does not say to beware of the worship of statues, but of the statues themselves, because evidently they cannot be had in a temple without being adored.

Fourth he proves, because temples are instituted for living and iconic images instituted by God, such as Baptism, which is an image of internal sanctification and grace, and the sacred Supper, which is an image of the Lord's body: just as therefore temples are adorned with these living images in a certain way, so they are dishonored by dead images, etc.

Fifth, he proves from Book IV, chapter 9, §9, from Epiphanius in his letter to John of Jerusalem, where he says it is against the authority of Scripture that an image of a man should hang in the Church: and he speaks of an image which he says was of Christ or some Saint.

Sixth, others add that Emperor Hadrian (as testified by Aelius Lampridius in the Life of Emperor Alexander) ordered temples to be built without statues for the favor of Christians.

These are their arguments, by which however we are not at all terrified, and we assert that images of Saints are placed nowhere better than in temples. It is proved first, because in the Old Testament, when the Jews were most prone to idolatry, there were images of Cherubim in the temple, Exodus XXV and III Kings VI.

Second, it is proved from the custom of the Church, which existed in the first five hundred years, so that Calvin's shameless lie

appears. Tertullian in his book On Modesty, before the middle, twice testifies that in the sacred chalices of the Catholic Church, Christ was depicted in the form of a shepherd carrying a wandering sheep on his shoulders back to the fold; and this was so common that the Catholics, against whom Tertullian writes in that book, took an argument from this to prove that penance, even for grave sins, is granted in the Church. But certainly sacred chalices are usually placed in the Church and in the most sacred place.

Sozomen, Book V, chapter 20, and Nicephorus, Book X, chapter 38, write that in the time of Julian the Apostate, a statue of Christ which had been at Paneas was brought into a temple by Christians. Which was certainly done before the year of the Lord 500, since Sozomen did not reach to that year. Eusebius in Books III and IV of the Life of Constantine says that in the temples built by Constantine in Palestine there was the greatest abundance of golden and silver images.

Nazianzen in letter 49 to Olympius complains that the city of Diocaesarea was to be overthrown, in which he himself had wonderfully adorned a temple; and he adds: "For if statues are thrown down, this does not torture us, although it tortures us otherwise, but," etc.

Damasus in the Life of Sylvester writes that Constantine placed in the place where he had been baptized a lamb of purest gold, to the right of the lamb a silver statue of the Savior, to the left a silver statue of John the Baptist. But in the Lateran Church itself he placed silver images of the Savior, the twelve Apostles, and four Angels. In the VII Synod, act 6, it is related how the disciples of St.

Epiphanius erected a temple to Epiphanius and placed his image in it.

Basil in his oration on St. Barlaam at the end, in the very sermon shows the image of St. Barlaam painted somewhere in the temple, and says he rejoices that the painters expressed his hand burned for Christ better than he himself described it in his oration: "I go away," he says, "conquered by the painting of the brave Martyr's deeds. I rejoice in such a victory of your fortitude, defeated today. I see the hand extended to the fire, the struggle more exactly described by you. I see the wrestler more illustriously depicted in your image."

Gregory of Nyssa in his oration on Theodore, at the beginning: "He is delighted," he says, "while he looks upon the house, as a temple of God, elaborated both with the magnitude of structure and the splendor of added ornament; where the craftsman formed wood into the figure of animals, and the painter also introduced flowers of art depicted in the image, the brave deeds of the Martyr, struggles, tortures, savage and inhuman forms of tyrants, violent attacks, that fiery furnace, the most blessed consummation of the athlete, an effigy of Christ the president of contests in human form, all these things as if in a certain book containing interpretations of languages, artificially depicting with colors, he expressed to us the struggles and labors of the Martyr, and adorned the temple like a pleasant and flowering meadow. For even silent painting on a wall is accustomed to speak and be most profitable."

In the Mass of Chrysostom, which Erasmus made Latin, it is thus: "The priest goes out from the small door carrying the

Gospel, with a minister preceding with a lamp, and turned toward the image of Christ between two doors, with bowed head and with exclamation he says," etc.

Evodius in Book II On the Miracles of St. Stephen writes that in the Church where the relics of St. Stephen were kept, there was also a painted image of the same Martyr, to see which frequent people were accustomed to run together.

Prudentius in the hymn on St. Cassian writes that he saw the image of St. Cassian above his altar in his temple:

"I raised my face to heaven, there stood opposite / The painted image of the Martyr with colors. / Bearing a thousand wounds, lacerated through all limbs, / Showing skin broken with minute punctures."

Likewise concerning St. Hippolytus:

"The painted form over the tomb lives with flowing shadows, / Representing the bloody limbs of the dragged man."

Paulinus in his letter to Severus complains that he had himself depicted in the temple together with St. Martin, and asks that at least these verses be inscribed:

"Martin stands, the perfect rule of life, / Paulinus teaches how you may merit forgiveness. / Look upon this one, you sinners, that one, you blessed, / He provides an example to the holy, this one to the guilty."

And on the tenth birthday of St. Felix, he says:

"And let us be carried into holy halls, / And let us wonder at the lean monuments of ancient figures," etc.

Nicephorus, Book XIV, chapter 2, writes that Pulcheria Augusta placed in the temple which she herself built at Constantinople an image of Blessed Mary, which Eudoxia had sent to her from Jerusalem.

Valentinian the Younger, admonished by Pope Sixtus (as Anastasius who completed the Pontifical of Damasus, Platina, and others write in the Life of Sixtus), placed in the Church of St. Peter above the tomb, that is, above the altar of Blessed Peter, a golden image of the Savior, adorned with most precious gems, and twelve images of the Apostles, also golden.

Blessed Augustine in Book I of the Consensus of the Evangelists, chapter 10, testifies that in many places in his time Christ could be seen depicted among the Apostles Peter and Paul: and he says the same about the history of Abraham willing to sacrifice his son, in Book XXII Against Faustus, chapter 73. But it is not credible that Augustine speaks of private houses, to which not everyone has access, but of public places, and not profane but sacred places. For Blessed Gregory in Book IX, letter 9, says that images of Saints were painted in venerable places not without reason by the ancients. Where by the name of ancients he cannot understand men of his age, but of earlier ones; but he himself flourished after the year 500. Therefore he speaks of Fathers who flourished before the year 500.

Finally Adrian I, in his book for images, which is found after the VII Synod near the end, reports that Sylvester, Damasus, Celestine, Sixtus, Leo, John, and Pelagius, Pontiffs, adorned temples with paintings. But all these sat before the year of the Lord

500. You see therefore how excellently Calvin lies when he says in the Institutes, Book I, chapter XI, §13, that there were no images in Christian temples in the first 500 years.

Third, it is proved from four Councils, two Eastern and two Western. In the East the VII Synod was celebrated entirely for this matter. Likewise in the VIII Synod, canon 3, the decrees of the seventh Synod are renewed. In the West a Roman Council was celebrated under Gregory III, which was indeed national, but nearly a thousand Bishops gathered for that Council. In that Council the heresy of the Iconoclasts, who were removing images from temples, was condemned at the very beginnings of this controversy. See Sigebert in his Chronicle of the year 633. A Council was also celebrated in the time of Stephen and Charlemagne for the same matter, as Adrian I testifies, who succeeded Stephen, in his book for images to Charles.

Fourth, it is proved by reason: for sacred signs can be placed nowhere better than in sacred places. Then there is no better ornament of temples than sacred images, because images both adorn the temple and contain the minds of men so they do not wander in vain thoughts. Moreover the temple is a certain image of heaven; for the Apostle in Hebrews IX compares the Mosaic tabernacle with heaven, and Chrysostom in homily 36 on the first to the Corinthians says that the temple of Christians is like the palace of heaven, or a certain terrestrial heaven. Therefore just as the temple is an image of heaven, so it is fitting that in the temple itself there should be images of those who are in heaven, that is, of Christ and the Saints. Finally, where will images of Saints be better placed

than in their own houses, that is, in the basilicas of Saints, where their relics rest?

To the first argument the solution is clear. For that was not an argument but a lie.

To the second, Payva responds that the Council of Elvira only prohibits the image of God which is painted to represent God's own likeness. But this does not seem to satisfy, both because the Council speaks generally about pictures, and also because such images were not in use at that time, indeed never were there such images in the Church, which are true idols, as we showed above by the testimonies of Origen, Augustine, and Damascene: but the Council speaks of what used to be done, and forbids that it be done henceforth.

Nicholas Sander in Book II On the Veneration of Images, chapter 4, responds that that Council prohibited images in temples because time and place required it. For then there was danger lest the Gentiles think that our people adored wood and stones, and finally there was danger lest in persecutions the images would be treated contemptuously by persecutors. This solution is good.

Nor does it object that some say this Council was celebrated after the Nicene Council, and therefore there was no danger of persecutions; for truly this Council was celebrated before the Nicene, when persecutions still lasted, as appears from canon 25, where it treats of those who brought letters from Confessors. For those who confessed the faith in persecution were accustomed afterward to give letters of recommendation for the lapsed to Bishops; and in almost the whole Council it treats of those who fall into

idolatry. I confess however that the reason of that canon: "Lest what is worshipped and adored be painted on walls," does not much fit this exposition.

Alanus Copus in his Dialogues, Book V, chapter 16, says that here images are prohibited because they began to be adored by those Christians as gods, and this is the sense: "It has been decided that there should be no pictures in the Church, lest something existing on walls be adored and worshipped as God." Blessed Ivo accepted this canon in this sense in his decrees, part III, chapter 40, but the reason of the canon does not entirely fit this exposition either: for it should rather have said, lest what is painted be adored, than lest what is adored be painted.

Others therefore say that only images painted on the walls of the Church are prohibited, but not that those painted on tablets or veils should not be had in the Church; and they want the reason to be for the honor of images, because they are most easily corrupted on walls, either by the moisture of walls, or by decay, or for another reason. For this reason it was also once prohibited that a cross be sculpted in pavements, lest it be trampled; and then this will be the sense: "It has been decided that pictures should not be in the Church," that is, in the fabric itself or walls of the Church, "lest what is adored and worshipped be painted on walls," that is, lest it happen that a sacred and venerable thing, such as holy images are, be on walls where they are most easily corrupted. This exposition most aptly fits the reason of the canon.

Add finally, whatever the Council decreed, that Council is rather for us than against us; for against us there can only be a

Council of 19 Bishops, which was provincial and not at all confirmed, and seems to have erred in other decrees, especially since in very many cases it does not want to absolve the penitent even at the point of death.

(For thus I understand what the Council says about communion being given, although there are not lacking those who by communion understand only the Eucharist. But I am moved by these reasons. First, because in the same Elviran Council, reconciliation and communion are taken for the same thing; for in canon 69 we read thus: "It was decided that penance should be performed, and thus reconciliation given, unless the necessity of illness should compel giving communion before the time." Where you see that to reconcile and to give communion are the same thing, or certainly that reconciliation is included in communion itself. For the ancients were accustomed always to join the Sacrament of reconciliation with the Sacrament of the Eucharist. And therefore Tertullian and Cyprian, and other writers of the same antiquity, take communion, reconciliation, and peace for the same thing. Second, because Saint Innocent in his letter to Exuperius, chapter 2, correcting the ancient observance, which was of the time of the Council of Elvira, quite clearly indicates that it was customary to deny reconciliation to some penitents, even at the end of life. "It has been asked," he says, "what ought to be observed concerning those who, after baptism, having been devoted to the pleasures of incontinence at all times, demand penance and reconciliation of communion together at the extreme end of their life. Concerning these, the prior observance was harsher, the later, with mercy inter-

vening, is more inclined. For the former custom held that penance be granted, but communion be denied. For since in those times persecutions were frequent, lest the facility of communion granted might make men secure about reconciliation and not recall them from lapse, communion was deservedly denied and penance granted, lest everything be entirely denied, and the harshness of the times made remission more difficult. But after our Lord restored peace to His churches, now with terror driven away, it was decided to give communion to the dying, both because of the Lord's mercy as a viaticum to those departing, and lest we seem to follow the harshness and hardness of the Novatian heretics who deny forgiveness. Therefore extreme communion is granted with penance, so that men of this sort may be vindicated from perpetual destruction in their final moments, with the Savior permitting." These are Innocent's words, from which it seems worth considering that Innocent did not say that reconciliation was once granted to the lapsed and communion denied; but that penance was granted and communion denied. For penance was first granted to the lapsed, that is, the action of penance was enjoined, then at another time reconciliation was granted. Hence is that saying of Augustine in letter 180 to Honoratus: "some demanding baptism, others reconciliation, others even the very action of penance." Furthermore, that by the name of penance in Innocent's text, not reconciliation but the action of penance is to be understood, is clear from the fact that he himself says that to those seeking penance and reconciliation of communion, penance was granted lest everything be denied, and communion was denied lest men, secure about reconciliation, not

be recalled from lapse, and because the harshness of the times made remission more difficult. Where you see that in Innocent's view, to deny communion is the same as to deny reconciliation and remission. This is perceived even more clearly in the following words, where it is said that in later times communion was granted, lest the Church seem to imitate the harshness and hardness of the Novatians, who denied forgiveness. Therefore, according to Innocent's opinion, to deny communion is to deny forgiveness and to imitate the hardness of the Novatians, who, as Cyprian testifies in book II, letter 4, Ambrose in book 1 on penance, chapter 2, and Socrates in book IV, chapter 23, granted penance and exhorted to it, but taught that reconciliation was to be sought from God, not to be imparted by priests. But nothing could be said more clearly than what Innocent added at the end, namely that communion is now granted with penance, so that men may be vindicated from perpetual destruction in their departure from this life. For it follows that those to whom communion is denied are not at all freed from perpetual destruction; which would not be a consequence if, with communion denied, reconciliation were not also denied.)

But this works for us, because from this it is clearly gathered that at that time there were images in temples, for the Council would not say: "It was decided that pictures should not be in the Church," unless they had already begun to exist. Moreover, from this we have that either the images themselves, or certainly the Saints whose images they are, are venerated and adored; for this is what that phrase signifies: "Lest what is venerated and adored be painted on walls." Add that this same Council in canon 26 ordains

fasting on every Sabbath; and in canon 33 prohibits the use of wives to bishops, priests, deacons, and subdeacons; both of which our adversaries execrate.

To the third point I say that Augustine speaks of idols presupposing the error of the Gentiles. For Augustine wants to say that when someone thinks an idol is God, and approaches to adore and invoke the idol itself, he is wonderfully confirmed and fostered in error by the very similarity of human limbs. That he is to be understood thus I prove from his words; for in letter 49, question 3, he says: "When they are placed in these seats with honorable sublimity, so that they may be attended to by those praying and sacrificing by the very similarity of animate limbs and senses, etc." Where note that phrase "so that they may be attended to by those praying." And what he says there: "Especially with the veneration of many approaching, etc." For experience teaches that images which are not held to be gods deceive no one, however unlearned, so that they are thought to live and breathe.

To that about the golden vessels of the Church I say that Augustine wanted to show that the idols of the Gentiles contain men in error, not by reason of the material, because they are precious, but by reason of the figure, which has a form similar to ours; Augustine shows this in two ways. First, because many turn their back to the sun, and meanwhile supplicate to an idol of the sun: not because the sun is not far nobler, but because that globular figure of the sun does not so easily persuade that the sun lives and feels, as does the figure of an idol, which is similar to ours. Second, because Catholics also have vessels of precious material in sacred

places, and yet because human form is lacking, not even the Gentiles would think those vessels live or breathe.

You will say, if chalices are not thought to live because they lack human form, therefore images which have human form, if they are in a temple, will be thought to live. I respond: Augustine does not say that images of human form are thought to live; but if they are thought to live, they are thought so because of form, not because of material. Therefore Augustine does not say that images were not in the Church, but only that the human form of idols is very effective for fostering error in those who venerate idols as gods. To the confirmation I say that John speaks of idols. For thus it is in the Greek: φυλάξατε έαντοὺς ἀπὸ των ειδώλων (guard yourselves from idols): from which Greek text the Latin text may be interpreted.

To the fourth point I say: First, Calvin rightly imitates his predecessors; for even the ancient Iconoclasts said they did not want these dead images, but that the Eucharist, which is the image of the Lord's body, sufficed for them; to whom the Catholics responded in the VIII Synod, act 6, that the Eucharist ought not to be called an image or figure of the Lord's body, since it is truly the Lord's body itself. Second, I say that living and dead images are not contrary to each other, but some are helped by others, as we have shown. Finally, images of Saints are not rightly called dead. For the life of an image is representation. Therefore those are dead which represent nothing.

To the fifth point, Thomas Waldensis, tome III, title 19, chapter 157, says that Epiphanius did this because of the heresy of

the Anthropomorphites then flourishing. Others say that Epiphanius speaks of an image of a profane man, which was honored there like images of Christ and Saints; thus responds Marianus Victorius in his annotation on this letter. The more common and truer solution is that those words are supposititious; which is clear first, because they were added after the end of the letter; for the letter was plainly finished, as will appear to the reader.

Second, because the heretical Iconoclasts did not object this passage to the Catholics, although they objected all sayings of the Fathers which could have any color, as is clear from the VII Synod, act 6.

Third, because Epiphanius the Deacon in the VII Synod, act 6, proves that two other similar passages were inserted into Epiphanius's writings by heretics.

Fourth, because as is said there, the disciples of Epiphanius placed his image in his temple, which they certainly would not have done if their teacher had said this was against the authority of Scripture.

Fifth, because in the time of Epiphanius, Basil, Nyssenus, and others lived, who praised images in temples.

Sixth, because that opinion that it is against the authority of Scripture to hang an image of a man in a temple would be unworthy of Epiphanius, a most learned man, since it is most inept. For nowhere is this read as prohibited; indeed, the contrary is read, as is clear from the images of Cherubim in human form, which were in Solomon's temple.

Seventh, because Gregory in book IX, epistle 9, says that no bishop before Serenus of Marseilles ever broke an image of Christ or Saints.

Eighth, because Blessed Jerome in his letter to Pammachius, against John of Jerusalem, recites almost this entire letter of Epiphanius as translated by himself into Latin, and yet makes no mention of this veil.

Ninth, because the style does not agree with the rest of the letter.

To that about Adrian's temples without idols, I say that Adrian ordered temples to be made without idols of the Gentiles. For Christians did not want to pray in temples of the Gentiles, because they were full of idols. Therefore Adrian ordered temples to be made for them without such idols. Hence the same Lampridius calls those idols there "numina" (divine powers); but images are not called numina unless they are proposed to be adored as gods.

CHAPTER TEN
IMAGES ARE USEFUL EVEN OUTSIDE OF HISTORY

Calvin's final assertion, that images without historical notation are not useful, is manifestly false; for he himself proves by no argument that they are not useful, and we can prove that they are useful in several ways. First, because God commanded that images of Cherubim be made in his temple, without any historical notation, Exodus XXV, and certainly not without cause.

Second, because Christians have always had images, even solitary ones and outside of histories, although the first Christians were not led by mere delight. In the time of Christ, three images are recorded to have been made. The first is that which Christ himself made by applying linen to his face, and sent to King Abgar. This is reported by Evagrius book IV, chapter 26, and Metaphrastes in the life of Constantine the Great, and Damascene book I, on images: and that this is not a fable is testified by the immense miracle performed at Edessa through this image, as Evagrius writes in the same place. The feast day that was celebrated at Constantinople on the day of the translation of this image from Edessa to Constantinople also testifies to this.

The second is that which a woman liberated from the flow of blood erected to Christ at Paneas; Eusebius is a witness, book VII of the history, chapter 14, who asserts that he saw it himself. Sozomen mentions the same, book V, chapter 20; Damascene book I, on images; and Theophylact in chapter IX of Matthew.

The third is that which Nicodemus is said to have made, and which, when mockingly crucified by the Jews, became famous through innumerable miracles. Athanasius reports this in his booklet on the passion of the image of the Lord, chapter 4. And although it may be doubtful whether this is the work of the great Athanasius, nevertheless it is certain that it is by a most ancient author; since it is cited as most ancient history in the VII Synod, act 4.

Besides these images of Christ, there also exist images of the blessed Virgin, which blessed Luke is said to have painted, which Theodore the Lector mentions, who flourished a thousand years ago, book I of Collections; Nicephorus book XIV of the history, chapter 2; and Simeon Metaphrastes in the life of Saint Luke. Tertullian in the book on modesty mentions an image of Christ in the form of a shepherd, carrying a sheep on his shoulders, depicted on sacred chalices, as we said above. Aelius Lampridius in the life of Alexander Severus reports that Emperor Alexander had images of Christ and Abraham in his household shrine. But certainly it is credible that he learned from Christians how Christ ought to be painted. Eusebius book VII of the history, chapter 14 says that images of the Apostles were customarily painted everywhere, and that he had seen many most ancient ones. Ambrose in the epistle on the

discovery of saints Gervasius and Protasius, which exists in Surius, says that he recognized the one who had appeared to him to be blessed Paul, from a painted image which he had with him.

Chrysostom in the oration on Saint Meletius says that images of Meletius were so celebrated that they were seen even on rings, on cups, on bowls, on bedroom walls, and everywhere else. Similarly Theodoret in the religious history, in the life of Simeon Stylites, says that at Rome it was customary for images of Saint Simeon to hang in front of all workshops.

That there were very frequent images in Augustine's time is gathered from book 1 on the consensus of the Evangelists, chapter 10, where he says that images of Christ depicted between Peter and Paul are found everywhere. Many other testimonies of Athanasius, Basil, Nazianzen, Nyssen, Chrysostom, Cyril of Jerusalem, and Cyril of Alexandria, and many other Fathers, see in the VII Synod, act 4, and book III of Damascene's Apologetic at the end. You may also add to these all those things which we brought forward a little earlier, to prove that images existed in temples in the first five hundred years.

Third, it is proven by their utilities. The first is instruction and education. For sometimes a picture teaches better than Scripture; of this utility Saint Gregory of Nyssa makes mention, in the oration on Theodore, and Saint Gregory the Pope book VII, epistle 109, and book IX, epistle 9. You will say that depicted histories indeed instruct, but not solitary images. I respond that even solitary images, as painted by Christians, always contain as if in summary some history. For when Christ is painted, he is always painted ei-

ther in the form of a child in his mother's bosom, or in the form of a man bound to a column, or hanging on a cross, or rising from the tomb, or ascending to heaven, etc. Thus also Saints are always painted with the insignia of virtue, or of passion, or of power: Peter with keys, Lawrence with a gridiron, Andrew with a cross, etc. All martyrs with a palm, all saints with a diadem. From these signs or instruments we learn as if in summary what those whom we venerate have done, or what they have suffered.

Second, images are useful, although solitary, for fostering and increasing charity toward God and the Saints. For one who loves gladly looks upon the image of an absent friend, and by looking is more inflamed. Hence Severus Sulpicius, because he loved saint Paulinus most vehemently, and yet could not always be with him, asked him through letters that he send him his image expressed from life; to whom Paulinus responded most modestly, excusing himself, epistle 8 to Severus, that he did not yet have the perfect image of the second Adam, but still bore the likeness of the first Adam, and therefore did not wish to send it. Gregory also, book VII, epistle 53, sending to Secundinus an image of the Savior, says that he knows he will receive the image, so that he might be rekindled in love of the Lord himself.

The third utility is incitement to imitation. This utility is explained at length in the VII Synod, act 6, at the end; Basil speaks of the same in the oration on the forty Martyrs. It is known from Terence in the Eunuch, how vehemently a certain youth, having seen a tablet in which Jupiter was painted inflicting assault upon Diana, was provoked to perpetrate a similar crime. On the con-

trary, however, Nazianzen in the poem on virtue, which is cited in the VIII Synod, act 4, says that an unchaste woman, when she had come being summoned to someone, saw on the very threshold an image of Polemon, a most continent man, and thence confused she blushed, and led by repentance returned to her own home.

Fourth, images are useful because they preserve in us the memory of Christ and the Saints, and at the same time in difficulties teach us that we have patrons whom we may invoke. Hence Theodoret in the life of Simeon Stylites says that at Rome there were very frequent images of saint Simeon, so that by this means many might prepare for themselves protection and defense.

The fifth utility is confession of faith, for while we love and honor the images of Saints, we testify that their faith pleases us, and their doctrine, and their holy conduct: and at the same time that we detest all impiety and idolatry, against which they themselves fought even unto death. And now especially we testify that the novelties of the Lutherans and Calvinists do not please us, while we religiously venerate that which they sacrilegiously destroy.

The sixth is honor to God and the Saints; for no one has ever doubted that to erect statues or images to great men pertains to their honor. Certainly Eusebius book VII of the history, chapter 14 indicates that this was the principal cause why Christians began to desire images of Saints.

Nor does it stand in the way what he says, that this arose from the custom of the Gentiles; for he does not speak of any superstition of the Gentiles, but of a natural, and therefore good custom, by which they were accustomed to erect statues to those

whom they judged worthy of honor, although they later erred in this, that they erected them even to wicked men and false gods.

CHAPTER ELEVEN
THE QUESTION CONCERNING THE CULT OF IMAGES IS PROPOSED, WITH THE ARGUMENTS OF ADVERSARIES

We have demonstrated thus far that images of Christ and Saints can be made and possessed, and placed in temples and other sacred places: now follows the controversy concerning cult, namely whether such images ought to be pursued with some kind of cult. Concerning this controversy Damascene in the book on heresies near the end brings forward two extreme heresies. One of those who said that divine honors were owed to images, whom he calls heretics Christianocategorous, that is, accusers of Christians, because on account of them Christians were accused as worshippers of idols. In the same way it is certain that Alexander Severus worshipped images of Christ and Abraham, with his other idols, with Aelius Lampridius as witness. This heresy is refuted by all testimonies of Scripture, which forbid that we attribute to a creature the cult proper to God.

The other error, contrary to the former, is of those who allow no honor at all to be given to images of Saints. Damascene re-

ports this error in the book on heresies at the end, and it is the error of all those whom we have reviewed in the second chapter of the disputation, who indeed contend that images are not to be venerated in any way, on account of these arguments.

First, because the Scriptures of both Testaments severely forbid the cult of simulacra, Exodus XX, Deuteronomy IV, Romans I, etc. And because Catholics respond that the Scriptures reprove the cult which is attributed to simulacra as to Gods: Calvin book I of the Institutes chapter 11, §§ 9 and 10, attempts to show that even the Jews and Gentiles did not have simulacra as Gods, but worshipped the true God in simulacra: and nevertheless they are reproved, because God does not allow his cult to be communicated in any way with images; and certainly if God ought not to be worshipped in an image, in the same way Saints, even if they were to be worshipped, nevertheless ought not to be worshipped in images. That the Jews did not have simulacra as Gods, but worshipped the true God in an idol, Calvin proves, because Exodus XXXII, the people said concerning the golden calf: "These are your gods, O Israel, who brought you out of the land of Egypt." Where they confess that they worship in the calf that God by whom they had been liberated from Egypt, and there Aaron, about to proclaim a feast day in honor of the golden calf, ordered it to be said by herald's voice: "Tomorrow is the solemnity of the Lord," where in Hebrew that word "Lord" is יהוה (YHWH). And Judges XVII, a certain woman says: "I have sanctified and vowed to the Lord a thousand and one hundred pieces of silver, that I might

make a graven and molten image" ([1]). Where also for "Lord" is the proper name of the true God יהוה (YHWH).

That the Gentiles worshipped the true God in idols is proven first from Augustine on Psalm CXIII, who reports that Gentiles were accustomed to respond, when they were accused of idolatry, that they did not worship the idols themselves, but the divine power that was signified through the idol. Also from the fact that Gentiles changed simulacra at will, and yet did not change gods. Also because they erected many simulacra to one God; for they said there was one Jupiter, and yet they dedicated innumerable simulacra to him. Finally, because they consecrated new idols daily, and yet did not say they were making new gods.

Second, they adduce three Councils: the Constantinopolitan, under Leo the Iconoclast, with Paul the Deacon as witness book XXI. Also another Constantinopolitan of 338 Bishops under Constantine Copronymus, with Paul the Deacon as witness book XXII of Roman affairs; both defined that images should be abolished. The acts of both are reported at length by the Centuriators, Century VIII, chapter 9. The third was the Council of Frankfurt, in which the VII Synod was disapproved, which had determined that images should be retained. Thus report Ado in the Chronicle in the year 795, the Abbot of Ursperg in the Chronicle of the year 793, Hincmar of Rheims book against the Bishop of Laon, chapter 20, and John Aventinus in the history or annals of the Bavarians book IV, Annonius book IV, Rhegino book II.

---

[1] Exod. XXII, 4 et 5; Jud. XVIII, 3.

Furthermore the Magdeburg Centuriators Century VIII, chapter 9, at the end, from this Council adduce 10 arguments against images, and solve 44 arguments of the Nicene Synod, and respond to 11 testimonies of Fathers, which had been brought forward for images by the Nicene Synod. But both the arguments and the solutions are mere trifles, for that Nicene Synod never existed, as we shall say below in its place.

Third, they adduce the four books of Charlemagne against images, from which Calvin book I of the Institutes, chapter 11, deduces two things. First, that the Nicene Council was immediately refuted by an Orthodox Prince. Second, that in that Nicene Council manifest impiety was defined. For, as appears from the book of Charles, in that Council it was defined that the honor of sacrifices was owed to images, and that cult which is attributed to the life-giving Trinity. This book appeared in the year 1549. The Centuriators add Century VIII, chapter 9, column 643, that there exists another book, still more severe against images, of Louis the Pious, if however it is worthy of belief.

Fourth, they adduce the Fathers; for Irenaeus book I, chapter 24, places among the heresies of Carpocrates, that he worshipped an image of Christ and Paul. Epiphanius heresy 79 says that those are heretics who carry around and worship an image of the blessed Virgin. Ambrose on the death of Theodosius: "Helena," he says, "found the cross of the Lord, she adored the King, not the wood certainly, because this is a Gentile error, but she adored him who hung on the wood." Jerome in chapter III of Daniel: "Worshippers," he says, "of God ought not to adore im-

ages." Augustine on the morals of the Church, chapter 36: "I know," he says, "adorers of pictures." Gregory book VII, epistle 54 and 109, and book VIII, epistle 9, says that images are not to be adored. Certain other testimonies are adduced by the Iconoclasts, in the VII Synod, act 6, and are refuted in the same place; but they are easy.

Fifth, they adduce the example of Hezekiah, IV Kings XVIII, who broke the bronze serpent, because it had begun to be worshipped.

Sixth, Calvin adduces experience, which teaches that gradually in the cult of images superstition and error creep in, by which it is thought that Divinity is bound to the image. For why otherwise is one image of Christ or Mary frequented more than another? Why do they approach images to pray? Why do some make pilgrimages with great labor to some image, when they have perhaps better and more beautiful ones at home?

Seventh, they adduce several little arguments; for an image, they say, is not capable of honor, since it is an inanimate thing, and lacking sense and reason. Also an image is not holy by reason of wood, or iron, or marble, or any other material, but neither by reason of lineaments, or colors, or any other thing that is in it; why therefore is it worshipped? Finally man is the image of God, and yet is not customarily adored: how much less therefore ought woods and stones to be adored, even if they represent the image of God or of Saints.

And these are their principal supports, which will be responded to below in chapter 13. For I will gladly omit the other

trifles of the Magdeburgians, for they are unworthy to be responded to. Christ, they say, died for men, not for images, therefore images are not to be worshipped. Excellently, of course. Also if images necessarily had to be worshipped, only the rich would be saved, who can buy them. Also Christ did not say, "who receives images," but "who receives you, receives me"; therefore the honor of an image is not referred to the exemplar. Which is indeed not to argue, but to play.

CHAPTER TWELVE
IMAGES OF CHRIST AND THE SAINTS ARE RIGHTLY VENERATED

We, together with the Church, assert that images of Christ and the Saints ought to be honored, provided however (as is declared in the Council of Trent, session XXV) that no confidence be placed in images, nor anything be petitioned from them, nor any divinity be believed to reside in them, but that they be honored only on account of those whom they represent to us. This position is proven as follows.

First, by the testimony of Scripture; we have three types of testimonies. First, those testimonies that deal expressly with images, namely Exodus XXV concerning the Cherubim of the mercy seat, and Numbers XXI concerning the bronze serpent. For the images of the Cherubim existing above the ark in Exodus XXV were necessarily adored by those who adored the ark. Indeed, Jerome in his letter to Marcella, urging her to migrate to Bethlehem, says for this reason that the tabernacle was venerated by the Jews, because the Cherubim were there. The bronze serpent also could not but be honored, since it had been placed by God in a high place and

brought salvation to the wretched who looked upon it. Hence Augustine in book III of On the Trinity, chapter 10, speaking of certain signs that merit veneration as religious objects, gives as an example the bronze serpent. Moreover, both concerning the images of the Cherubim and concerning the images of the serpent, that they ought to have been honored is clear from the rule of Blessed Augustine in book III of Christian Doctrine, chapter 9, where he says that useful signs divinely instituted are to be venerated, because the honor passes to the prototype (prototypum). But that those images of the Cherubim and the serpent were instituted by God and were useful is certain. Now indeed, if it was permitted to venerate images of Angels, why not also of Saints? If it was permitted to venerate the image of Christ in the form of a serpent (for we have that the serpent was a figure of Christ, John III), why should not the image of Christ in the form of man be rather venerable?

Next, we have other testimonies that teach that creatures are to be honored religiously on account of their relation to God alone, as Psalm XCVIII: "Adore the footstool of his feet." Matthew V: "Do not swear by heaven, because it is the throne of God, nor by the earth, because it is the footstool of his feet" (2). Where note that an oath is an act of religion by which God is honored primarily, and secondarily that by which one swears. Therefore God prohibits oaths without due circumstances by heaven and earth, lest insult be done to such creatures insofar as they have relation to

---

2 Psal. XCVIII, 5; Matth. V, 34 et 35

God. But images have a similar relation; therefore by the same reasoning they are to be venerated.

The final type of testimony is of those that teach that creatures are called sacred or holy on account of their relation to sacred things. Exodus III: "The place on which you stand is holy ground" (3); on account of the presence of the Angel, that is. Exodus XII speaks of the day of Passover as a holy and venerable day on account of its signification and because it was dedicated to divine worship. Exodus XXVIII speaks of the vestments of the priests as holy for the same reason. Isaiah XI calls the sepulcher of Christ glorious. II Timothy III speaks of the sacred letters: "From infancy," it says, "you have known the sacred letters" (4). Why are those letters called sacred, unless because they are signs of sacred things? And not only the letters, but also the words themselves when spoken, we are accustomed to venerate, especially the name Jesus; and we hear the Gospel standing with uncovered head, indeed even with lights kindled, although at midday, as Jerome proves in his book Against Vigilantius. But images of Christ and the Saints are also instituted to signify and represent sacred things; why therefore should it not be permitted to honor them? For that a sacred thing is venerable by the very fact that it is sacred is clear from those words in Exodus XII: "The first day shall be holy, and the seventh equally venerable with the same religious observance" (5).

---

3 Exod. III, 5.

4 II. Tim. III, 15.

5 Exod. XII, 16.

Where you see that a sacred thing and a religiously venerable thing are taken as the same.

Second, it is proven from the Councils of the Church. We have first canon 82 of the Sixth Synod, where images are called venerable; although indeed these canons are not of firm authority, nevertheless this canon was always received by the Church and testifies at least to the usage of the ancient Church. Then we have the Roman Synod under Gregory III, of nearly a thousand bishops celebrated for images in the year 733, according to Sigebert in his Chronicle. Likewise the Synod held at Villa Gentiliacensis in the year 766 according to Sigebert, or 767 according to Ado; in it the matter of images was treated, and the Greeks were admonished that they should wish to think with other pious persons concerning images, as Paul Aemilius testifies in book II. Again, another Synod for images celebrated at Rome under Stephen III in the year 768 according to Sigebert, which Synod Adrian mentions several times in his book on images to Charles.

Then after the year 788, the Seventh Synod in act 7 defined that images are to be venerated, not indeed with the worship of latria, but with that honor with which we also honor the sacred letters, sacred vessels, etc., as Paul the Deacon, Cedrenus, Zonaras, etc. testify. But this Council is of such a kind that it cannot be doubted in any way that it was general and legitimate. For it had first the legates of the Roman Pontiff and of three other Patriarchs—of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem—as well as the Patriarch of Constantinople, all consenting, as is clear from the subscribers. Moreover, 350 bishops were present, according to Ce-

drenus, that is, more than in the first, second, or third general Synod. Moreover, the Emperor Constantine consented. In addition to this, the matter was disputed keenly and at length, with Scriptures, Councils, and Fathers brought forward. If therefore any Council is general and legitimate, certainly this one is.

Nor does it matter that the preceding Constantinopolitan Councils and the following Frankfurt Council are said to have decreed the contrary. For even if all those had been legitimate, nevertheless they ought to yield to the Nicene; because this was plenary and general, those were particular. For it is a rule of Augustine in book II On Baptism, chapter 3, that particular councils must without doubt yield to plenary ones. But that those three were particular is clear; for in the Constantinopolitan under Leo, no Patriarchs were called or present except Germanus, Patriarch of Constantinople, who nevertheless did not consent and was therefore deposed.

In the Constantinopolitan Council under Constantine Copronymus, neither the Roman, Alexandrian, Antiochene, nor Jerusalem Patriarch was called or present, either in person or through legates, but only a pseudo-bishop whom the heretics had made Patriarch after deposing Saint Germanus. Cedrenus and Zonaras testify to these things in the life of Constantine Copronymus, and even the Magdeburg Centuriators in Century VIII, chapter 9, column 551, and Paul the Deacon, who was then living, in book XXII of Roman affairs.

Finally, the Frankfurt Council was particular by everyone's judgment, and (if what the Centuriators say is true) legates of the

Roman Pontiff indeed attended, but they did not assent to the Synod.

To this is added that from the outcome it is gathered that the Nicene was legitimate, for it alone finally prevailed. For images remained in temples and always had their honor in the Church; indeed, only the acts of this Council survive, the other three soon vanished, and only some memory of them is preserved in histories, which same thing happened to the first Nicene. For there were very many Councils celebrated by heretics against Nicene I, but they vanished with their errors, only the faith and canons of Nicaea came down to us. We have moreover the Eighth General Synod, final act, canon 3, and the Tridentine Synod, session XXV.

Third, it is proven from the Fathers. Basil against Julian, as Pope Adrian cites in his letter to the Emperors in the VII Synod, act 2: "I honor," he says, "the histories of their images, and I openly adore them, for this has been handed down to us by the holy Apostles and is not to be prohibited," etc.

Chrysostom in the liturgy: "The priest," he says, "bows his head to the image of Christ."

Ambrose, sermon 10 on Psalm CXVIII: "He who," he says, "crowns the image of the Emperor, certainly honors him whose image he has crowned, and he who has despised the statue of the Emperor seems certainly to have done injury to the Emperor," etc.

Augustine in book III of On the Trinity, chapter 40, speaking of sacred signs, such as images, letters, and Sacraments: "But because," he says, "these are known to men, because they are made by men, they can have honor as religious objects, they cannot have

amazement as marvels," etc. Where he specifically places the bronze serpent among those things that merit religious honor. Likewise in book III of Christian Doctrine, chapter 9, he says that those serve under signs who honor useful signs and do not know what they signify, such as the Jews once were. But those who venerate useful things and know what they signify, he says do not so much honor the sign itself as the thing signified, and therefore are free. But that images of the Saints are useful signs divinely instituted and therefore worthy of veneration both by servants and by the free is clear from book II of Christian Doctrine, chapter 25, where he says that pictures and statues pertain to the superfluous institutions of men, except those that are proposed in their proper place and time for a good purpose by one who has authority. But that such are the images of Christ and the Saints is most certain. Finally, in book X of the Confessions, chapter 34, he reproaches painters and similar craftsmen because they sometimes transgress far beyond the necessary and moderate use and pious signification. Where he admits that some pictures are necessary, some also have pious signification, and are therefore venerable.

Paulinus on the tenth birthday of Saint Felix, concerning images painted in the temple, says thus: "Let us wonder at the sacred figures, monuments of the ancients." Where when he calls the figures sacred, he also teaches that they are to be honored; for all sacred things are to be honored.

Gregory in book VII, letter 5, to Januarius, Bishop of Cagliari, speaking of the image of Blessed Mary and the cross that had been placed in the synagogue of the Jews, which he orders to

be removed from there: "With these words," he says, "we exhort that having removed from there with the veneration that is fitting, the image and the cross, you ought to restore what has been violently taken away." And in book VII, letter 53, to Secundinus, he teaches that a sacred image is to be honored even with prostration to the ground, but not as God: "And we," he says, "do not prostrate ourselves before it as if before the Divinity," etc.

Damascene in book IV, chapter 17, On the Faith, says it is an Apostolic tradition, the worship of the cross and images.

Moreover, that the cross, that is, the image of the crucified, has always been honored in the Church is most certain; for Lactantius in his poem on the passion of the Lord: "Bend the knee," he says, "and adore the venerable wood of the cross."

And Sedulius in book V of the Paschale Carmen: "Let no one be ignorant," he says, "that the form of the cross is to be venerated."

Ambrose in his oration on the death of Theodosius: "Wisely," he says, "did Helen act, who raised the cross of Christ on the head of kings, so that the cross of Christ might be adored in kings." And in his book On the Sacrament of the Lord's Incarnation, chapter 7: "When," he says, "we venerate the image of God and the cross in Christ, do we divide him?"

Jerome in the Life of Paula: "Prostrate," he says, "before the cross, as if she saw the Lord hanging, she adored."

Athanasius, question 16, to Antiochus, says that Christians worship the image of the cross rather than of the lance or column and similar instruments of the Lord's passion, because if the Gen-

tiles accuse us of worshipping wood, we can immediately separate the two pieces of wood of the cross from each other, and in this way, with the figure of the cross removed, trample those two pieces of wood, to show that we venerate not the wood but the image of the crucified. Finally, the Fathers testify that Christians were always accused by the Gentiles of worshipping the cross, which is the image of the crucified.

Tertullian in the Apologeticus, chapter 16, says Christians were called devotees of the cross: nor does he himself deny that this is true. Minucius Felix in the Octavius responds to the Gentiles objecting to the adoration of the cross. Nor does it matter that he himself says: "We neither adore nor desire the cross"; for he speaks of the adoration proper to God, of which they were accused. Meanwhile, from the objection it is established that the cross was in some way honored by Christians. Julian, cited by Cyril in book VI, makes the same objection. But certainly it would never have occurred to the Gentiles to object to our people the adoration of the cross, unless they had seen that the cross was held in highest veneration by those first and most holy Christians.

Ridiculous, however, is the response of the Magdeburgers, who from the Council of Frankfurt in Century VIII, chapter 9, at the end say that the reasoning is not the same for the cross and other images; for Christ redeemed us by the cross, not by an image. For this response first destroys the Centuriators themselves, since they themselves do not admit that the cross can be honored. Then it is an unskilled solution, for Christ did not redeem us by this cross, which we venerate now golden, now silver, now stone, now painted

on a tablet or marked in bronze, but by that one wooden cross, whose image is what we venerate. For we do not have everywhere that true cross of Christ, and much less did the ancients have it in the time of Tertullian and Minucius, since it is established that it was found later in the time of Constantine the Great. But Christ redeems us more by his body than by the wooden cross. Therefore, if it is permitted to venerate the image of the cross, much more the image of the body.

The fourth argument is from miracles. For God works many miracles through images of Christ and the Saints, from which we understand that it pleases him that images be honored. Illustrious first is what Eusebius relates in book VII of his history, chapter 14, where he testifies that from the base of the bronze statue of Christ placed by the woman with the flow of blood at Paneas, a certain herb unknown to all was accustomed to grow, which when it had grown up to the hem of the image of Christ and had touched it, had the power to drive away all diseases; which Theophylact also relates in chapter IX of Matthew. Sozomen adds in book V of his history, chapter 20, concerning the same image another miracle, namely that when Julian the Apostate had removed the statue of Christ from there and had placed his own in the same place, immediately fire from heaven tore apart Julian's statue and severed the head from the rest of the body, plainly in the same manner as once happened to the idol Dagon, I Kings V.

It is not to be passed over in this place, the notable lie of the Centuriators: for what happened to Julian's statue, they attribute also to the statue of the Savior. For they speak thus in Century IV,

chapter 13, column 1447: "It seems," they say, "that it too was shattered by lightning, so that there might remain testimony that that superstition by which some power is attributed to statues does not please God." And in the same place they call the power of that herb, which healed all diseases, superstitious. But when they say that the image of Christ was struck down by lightning, they lie most openly against the testimony of all historians. But when they ascribe the most attested miracles of Christ to diabolical superstition, they imitate the Scribes and Pharisees, who slandered that the miracles of that same Christ were done by Beelzebub.

Many other miracles done by God through images can be read in the Magdeburgers themselves, Century VI and following, chapter 13, who nevertheless respond to this argument from the Libri Carolini that it does not follow that images are to be adored because they work miracles. For there are many other things through which God works miracles, which nevertheless are not adored. For Elisha through the waters of the Jordan healed the leprosy of Naaman; Christ with spittle healed the blind man; and yet we do not adore water or spittle. Indeed, sometimes God works miracles through evil men, and yet we judge those men unworthy of all honor.

I respond that the purpose of miracles must be considered; for that which is confirmed by miracle has the testimony of God. Now Elisha and Christ did not employ water or spittle in miracles so that they might honor water or spittle, but so that the former might show himself to be a Prophet of God, the latter that he was the true Son of God. Similarly, evil men do not work miracles to

commend themselves or their life, but faith. Therefore not they themselves, but the faith they preach is to be venerated.

But miracles worked through images were done for this reason, that they might prove and establish the worship of images. For why, I ask, did heavenly fire tear apart the statue of Julian, unless to vindicate the injury done to the statue of Christ? And why did blood flow from the image pierced by Jews, which healed very many sick people, as is found in Athanasius in his book On the Passion of the Image of the Lord, Gregory of Tours On the Glory of the Martyrs, chapter 21, Regino in his Chronicle for the year 801, unless to show that he honors what the Jews were treating with contempt?

Moreover, the benefits that are conferred by God through images, why are they conferred only on those who honor images and who think it pleases God to worship images? For that miracle performed at Edessa through the image of Christ, as Evagrius relates in book IV, chapter 26, was done for the salvation of those who venerated the image of Christ. Zonaras also writes in the life of Michael Balbus that when Leo the Armenian was persecuting images, his son Sabbatius Constantine, who was mute, approached the statue of Saint Gregory Nazianzen and prayed to the saint himself in his mind, and received the use of speech by divine miracle. But if the worship of images were idolatry, God would certainly then have seemed especially to favor idolatry. Paul the Deacon writes in book XXI of Roman affairs that when a certain iconoclast, having seen a statue of the Blessed Virgin, had thrown stones at it and broken it, the Virgin herself was seen by him in sleep,

threatening terribly with these words: "You have done this to your own head." Then a little later the same man was struck by a stone and so crushed that he had broken the statue.

A fifth argument can be drawn from similarity in this way: man is worthy of veneration because he is the image of God; therefore other images of Christ or Saints are also worthy of veneration, for what belongs to one image because it is an image necessarily belongs to all images. But that man is venerable insofar as he is the image of God, Cyril and Augustine testify.

Cyril in catechesis 12 says thus: "A wooden image of an earthly king is honored; how much more the rational image of God?" Augustine in letter 203 to Maximinus, bishop of the Donatists, explains why in the heading of the letter he said: "To the honorable brother," and says that he does not honor his episcopate, but honors the image of God, which he knew to be in him, since he was man.

The Magdeburgers respond from the Libri Carolini that the argument concludes nothing, since painted images are not similar to man as he is the image of God; for the image of God is in the mind, but the likeness between man and pictures is in external figure. Unskillfully; for the argument proceeds from similar proportion: as man relates to God, whose image he is, so a picture relates to Christ, whose image it is; if therefore man is honorable because he is the image of an honorable thing, certainly a picture is also called honorable because it is the image of an honorable thing.

They respond secondly that man is not adored, at least religiously, but only civilly. But although man as king or emperor is

honored civilly, nevertheless man as the image of God is honored religiously; for the reason why a sacred thing is honored is just as one who honors a man because he is holy, or a prophet, or a priest, or a bishop, certainly honors religiously, not civilly, as we said above.

A sixth argument likewise from similarity: the image of a king is venerable with a certain civil honor; therefore images of Christ and the Saints are honorable with religious worship. And this argument can be confirmed from the notable fraud of Julian the Apostate, which Gregory Nazianzen describes in oration I against Julian, Paul the Deacon in the life of Julian, and others; it was established in custom that images of emperors be adored by all, which Christians also did, since they knew that adoration was only civil, such as they also offered to the Emperor himself, even though he was pagan. Julian therefore, to compel Christians to adore idols at least through error, ordered his image to be painted so that Jupiter would be painted simultaneously bringing a crown and purple to the Emperor from heaven; Mercury and Mars would also be painted looking toward the Emperor, so that in this way he might indicate that he was wise and strong. And so he proposed himself painted among the gods, so that Christians, according to custom venerating the image of the Emperor, would simultaneously venerate the images of false gods. Nazianzen notes that simpler Christians were worthy of pardon, who did not notice the deceit and did not think they were adoring anything other than the king's image.

The Centuriators respond in the noted place that these things are not similar, because the image of a king is adored on account of the absence of the king, who cannot be simultaneously everywhere in the whole kingdom; but God is present everywhere. But first, we do not ask why the image of a king is adored, but from the fact that it is adored, we conclude that the image of Christ is rightly adored. Moreover, Christ as man is not everywhere, nor are the Saints everywhere. Finally, it is false that images of princes are not adored when the prince is present; indeed, just as making insult to an image is a graver sin when the prince is present than when absent, so also honoring an image when the prince is present is a thing most pleasing to him.

A seventh argument from the contrary: an image is capable of injury and insult; therefore also of honor and worship. Eusebius in book IX of his history, chapter 10, writes that to the disgrace of Maximin, his images were either cast down or defaced with black colors. Suetonius writes the same about the images of Domitian.

Theodosius also (otherwise the best and most pious prince), when the Antiochenes had cast down the image of his wife, was so angry that he almost destroyed all of Antioch. There exist concerning this matter two orations of Chrysostom, that is, the second and third to the people of Antioch, in which he deplores that crime committed against Theodosius. See also Theodoret in book V, chapter 19 of his history. Finally, Julian the Apostate would not have cast down the statue of Christ unless he had believed that injury was done to Christ in this way. Nor would God have struck

Julian's statue with lightning unless he had received injury from him and unless this had seemed to pertain to Julian's disgrace.

An eighth argument: we rightly execrate and break the idols of the Gentiles, and hence Theodosius is greatly praised because, as Theodoret testifies in book V, chapter 20 of his history, he ordered idols to be destroyed everywhere. But certainly this is not done except by reason of signification, because they are images of false gods; therefore, on the contrary, images of Christ and the Saints, because they signify things truly good and holy, are honorable.

A ninth argument, from the wickedness of the Iconoclasts and the piety of those who worship and have worshipped images. For the Iconoclasts, as we showed in chapter 2 of this disputation, were all either Jews, or Samaritans, or Mohammedans, or necromancers, or manifest heretics, whom no one can deny to be impious. But those who defended images were holy and learned men, such as Gregory and Adrian, supreme Pontiffs, Germanus and Tarasius, bishops of Constantinople, John Damascene, Methodius, Leontius, Jonas of Orléans, Paul the Deacon, and other pious and learned men by universal consensus. But it is not credible that God would have wished to teach the Church through his enemies rather than through his friends and saints.

What of the fact that the Devil himself also hates images? For as we read in the Spiritual Meadow, chapter 45, when a certain hermit was complaining that the spirit of fornication, vexing him, had grown old with him and would not depart, the Devil appeared and promised to depart if he would promise no longer to venerate

the image of the Blessed Virgin that he had in his cell. But perhaps the Devil feigns hatred toward images so that men, deceived, might worship them more. But if this is so, why has the Devil so often through Jews and Mohammedans procured the overturning and breaking of images?

A tenth argument, from the unhappy end of the Iconoclasts and the happiness of those who defended images. For first, in the time of Leo the Iconoclast, after the images of the Saints were burned in the forum of Constantinople, there arose a pestilence so grave that three hundred thousand men died at Constantinople. See the Chronicle of Matthew Palmeri, year 741. Likewise, on the same occasion, the same Leo and his successors lost the empire of Italy and were never able to recover it again. See Zonaras and Paul the Deacon in his life. At that time the King of the Arabs, Ezides, who had ordered the images of Christians to be broken, did not survive one year, although thirty years had been promised to him by the one who had incited him to iconoclasm.

In the time of Constantine Copronymus, unheard-of calamities invaded the East; for huge earthquakes cast down entire cities and killed many thousands of men. Likewise, a most grave plague arose, so that vineyards, gardens, wells, and other places scarcely sufficed for burying men. And lest anyone doubt for what reason these things happened, simultaneously everywhere on men's clothes, on sacred veils, on priestly vestments, small crosses appeared divinely, as if marked with oil: for God wished to indicate that he wanted the image of the cross to be seen everywhere, which Constantine Copronymus was then striving to obliterate entirely.

To these things was added such horrible cold that the Pontic sea froze for a hundred miles, and the ice was thirty cubits deep, upon which came snow, which also turned to ice, to a height of twenty cubits above the other ice of thirty cubits. A little later the ice began to melt, and huge fragments like great mountains or islands ran about with great force, some of which even struck Constantinople and overturned part of the walls and neighboring houses. But Paul the Deacon testifies that he saw all these things. In the same year there was afterward such drought that rivers, springs, and wells almost all dried up, so that all understood and said that all these things happened on account of the impiety toward God and the Saints that the Iconoclasts had practiced.

Finally, the obstinate Emperor Constantine died in such a way that in death he cried out that he was delivered while still alive to inextinguishable fire to be burned. Zonaras and Paul the Deacon testify to this in his life. On the contrary, Pepin and his son Charles, who with the Roman Pontiff defended images, advanced to kingdom and empire and lived and reigned most happily, as is clear from the same authors.

CHAPTER THIRTEEN
THE ARGUMENTS OF ADVERSARIES ARE RESOLVED

It now remains for us to resolve the arguments of our adversaries. To Calvin's first argument, I say that in those Scriptures idolatry is condemned, that is, the worship of images which are held as gods, or through which those who are not truly gods are worshipped as gods.

Regarding that proof by which Calvin endeavors to show that Jews and Gentiles worshipped God in idols, I say that Calvin's words contain many falsehoods. The first is that Jews and Gentiles did not call their idols gods; for in Book I, chapter 11, §40 of the Institutes, objecting to himself the response of Catholics, he says: "They say, 'We do not call our gods images'"; then he responds: "Neither did they, whether Jews or Gentiles, call them so in former times, and yet the Prophets everywhere did not cease to reproach them for their fornications with wood and stone." But if the Jews did not call idols their gods, whence comes that from Exodus XXXII: "Make us gods who may go before us," and "These are your gods, O Israel"? Whence comes that from Micah in Judges

XVIII: "You have taken away my gods which I had made for myself"? And from III Kings XII concerning the two calves of Jeroboam: "Behold your gods, O Israel."

That images were called gods by the pagans, no one who has read anything in the poets or even the orators is ignorant. But one passage will now suffice from Daniel V: "They drank wine," it says, "and praised their gods of gold and silver, bronze, wood, and stone." And another from the book of Wisdom chapter XIII: "They called the works of their hands gods" (1). Could the divine Scripture refute Calvin's lie more clearly?

The second falsehood is that the Jews, when they made the golden calf, did not forget the true God. For Calvin's words are directly contrary to the words of Scripture. For Calvin in Book I, chapter 11, §9 says thus: "Nor were the Jews so thoughtless that they did not remember that God was he who had led them out of the land of Egypt." But Scripture says in Deuteronomy XXXII: "You have forsaken God who begot you, and have forgotten the Lord your creator." And in Psalm CV: "They made a calf in Horeb and worshipped a graven image, and they forgot God who saved them, who did great things in Egypt, wonders in the land of Ham, terrible things by the Red Sea." And Jeremiah chapter II: "They walked after vanity," that is, after idols, "and did not say, 'Where is the Lord who made us come up from the land of Egypt?'" (2) What could be clearer?

---

1 Dan. V, 4; Sap. XIII, 10.

2 Deut. XXXII, 18; Psal. CV, 19; Jerem. II, 5 et 6.

The third falsehood is that the Jews in all their idols wanted to worship the one true God. For thus says Calvin in Book I, chapter 11, §8: "They knew indeed that there was a God whose power they had experienced. But they wanted to know from a preceding image that God was to be their guide on the journey." And in §9 he says: "The Jews were persuaded that they were worshipping under such images the eternal God, one and true Lord of heaven and earth."

But I will prove this to be a falsehood. First, because if the Jews wanted only a bodily sign, there was no need for them to make a calf; for they had the cloud and the pillar of fire, which led better than a calf which had to be carried: therefore they sought not a bodily sign, but a bodily god. Second, because no reason can be given why they made a calf rather than a sheep or something else, unless because they were accustomed to see the greatest god of the Egyptians, who is a black calf marked with white spots, whom they themselves call Apis; concerning whom Cicero in Book I On the Nature of the Gods, and Augustine in Book XVIII On the City of God chapter 5, and all writers, Herodotus, Diodorus, Plutarch, Pliny, Suidas, Eusebius etc. Therefore the Jews, because they had seen a calf in the highest honor in Egypt, thought that calf itself was the God of heaven, and therefore they set up an image of a calf for him.

Third, because in Joshua's final chapter, choice is given to the Hebrews whether they wish to serve the foreign gods whom the idolaters Terah and Nahor serve, or the idols of the Amorites, or the God of Israel. Therefore they did not adore in idols, or think

they were adoring, the God of Israel. For otherwise they could have responded that that choice was foolish, since in the very idols of the Amorites and of Terah and Nahor they would worship the true God. The same is confirmed from III Kings XVIII, where Elijah says: "How long do you halt between two sides? If the Lord is God, follow him; if Baal is God, follow him." Where Baal is clearly opposed to the true God. Therefore when the Jews worshipped the idol Baal, certainly they did not worship the true God. Add that from Deuteronomy XXXII: "They sacrificed to demons and not to God, to gods whom they did not know." Add also that the Jews would be falsely accused of serving foreign gods, if in idols they always worshipped the true God. But you will say: how then is it said of the calf in Exodus XXXII: "These are your gods who brought you out of the land of Egypt"? How also is it said there of the calf: "Tomorrow is the Lord's festival"? And Judges XVII: "I have consecrated this silver to the Lord to make an idol"? (3)

To the first I respond that those words signify that the Jews thought they had received the benefit of liberation from Egypt not from the God of Moses, but from Apis, the god of the Egyptians. To the second and third, there is a double solution. One is Cajetan's in chapter XXXII of Exodus, that truly the very name of the Lord is attributed by idolatrous Jews to the idol, and perhaps Scripture signifies this in Wisdom XIV when it says: "They imposed the incommunicable name upon stones and wood" (4). For no name of

---

3 III. Reg. XVIII. 21; Deut. XXXII, 17; Exod. XXXII, 4; Judic. XVII, 3.

4 Sap. XIV, 21.

God is incommunicable except this יהוה (Yahweh), for the others are sometimes attributed also to creatures.

You will say, but that name יהוה (Yahweh) is the proper name of the God of Israel, therefore it could not be communicated. I respond that perhaps those Jews, who believed there were many true gods, did not think this was a proper name, but appellative. Perhaps also they communicated that name by similarity. For just as the Egyptians are accustomed to call the Nile their Jupiter, and we say of a brave man, "This is our Achilles," of a wise man, "This is our Cato": so the Jews said of the calf, "This is our יהוה (Yahweh); let Moses have his own."

The other solution is that of Abulensis, Cajetan, and others in chapter XVI of Judges, who say there were two kinds of idols among the Hebrews. One without the name of a certain god, such as was the idol of Micah in Judges XVII, and perhaps the golden calf which Aaron made in Exodus XXXII, and Jeroboam renewed in III Kings VII. For Scripture does not call the calf the god Moloch or Baal etc., but always says: "These are your gods, O Israel." The other kind was with a certain name, like Baal, Moloch, Ashtaroth, Chemosh etc., as can be seen in III Kings XI and elsewhere. Therefore they say, and not improbably, that concerning the first kind it can be admitted that the Jews thought in the idol they were worshipping the true God. However, in this also they erred most gravely, both because they sacrificed to the idol and believed divine power to be present in the very idol, and also because they imagined God to be corporeal and similar to the idol itself. From which it followed that they thought they were worshipping the true

God, but in reality they worshipped nothing but their own figment. Just as the Manicheans said they worshipped God the Father and his Son Christ, but because by God they understood corporeal light, by Christ they accepted this corporeal sun, they had nothing of God and Christ except the name alone.

That the Jews thought God was corporeal and similar to the idol, according to this opinion, is evident from the golden calf. For they therefore made God in the form of a calf because they had seen a calf in the highest honor in Egypt; from this they therefore thought that the supreme God was that calf, and in this way also the Jews truly forgot God, although they did not think they were forgetting him. But concerning idols of the second kind, it is so certain that the Jews neither worshipped nor thought they were worshipping the God of Israel, that even Peter Martyr the Calvinist admits this in chapter XVII of Judges.

The fourth falsehood is that the pagans did not think idols were gods. For thus says Calvin in Book I, chapter 11, §9: "Nor are the pagans to be believed to have been so stupid that they did not understand that God was other than wood and stones." Although some were not so stupid as to think that wooden or stone idols were gods, nevertheless very many were so stupid that they truly believed the very idols lived and felt and were gods. Nor was this as great a stupidity as Calvin wants it to seem. For the pagans were moved to believe that idols were gods for four reasons. First, because this was told to them by their pontiffs. Second, because they saw almost the whole world believe it. Third, because by the work of demons the idols were sometimes moved and spoke and predicted the future, or

rather seemed to be moved and to speak; for in reality the devil moved them and spoke in them, but the people believed they truly moved and spoke themselves. That idols were accustomed to speak is evident from chapter XXI of Ezekiel and chapter X of Zechariah, and from Book I, final chapter of Valerius Maximus. Fourth, because they were endowed with human form; and he who sees his own members feel and live easily persuades himself that things similar to himself also live and feel, especially if he hears this affirmed by wiser men. But whatever the causes were, I prove that many of the pagans believed the very idols were gods, and therefore Calvin lies.

Therefore I prove they believed idols to be gods, first from Scripture; for all the Prophets labor to teach that golden and silver idols are not gods, and they prove it because they do not speak, do not see, etc. See Isaiah XLVI, David Psalm CXIII and Psalm CXIV, and Habakkuk II, but especially the epistle of Jeremiah Baruch VI, where to individual arguments he concludes: "Whence let it be known to you that they are not gods" (5). But certainly the Prophets would be foolish if they tried to refute what no one asserted. Moreover in Acts XIX, the pagans say of Paul: "This Paul persuades, saying that they are not gods who are made by hands" (6). Therefore they themselves thought those made by hands were gods. Moreover Jeremiah II and Wisdom XIII and XIV, Scripture says that the pagans were accustomed to invoke idols and to commend their salvation to them: but no one invokes or prays to an

---

5 Baruch. VI, 14, 22 etc.

6 Act. XIX. 26.

image, says Augustine on Psalm CXIII, who does not think he is heard by it.

Second from the Fathers; Augustine in Book III On Christian Doctrine chapter 7: "I confess," he says, "that those who think the works of men are gods are more deeply deceived than those who think the works of God are." And below: "They venerate images either as gods or as signs and images of gods." And in epistle 49 and on Psalm CXIII he says that many pagans thought the very images lived, breathed, and heard, and therefore were living gods, and were fostered in this error by the very similarity of human members.

Tertullian in the Apologeticus chapter 12 says that the gods of the gentiles suffer more while being made by artificers than Christians suffer when they are killed for refusing to adore them. Eusebius in Book V of the Preparation chapter 15: "Hesiod," he says, "thinks there are thirty thousand gods on earth. But I see many more stone and wooden creators of men." Finally Cyprian, Lactantius, Arnobius, Minutius Felix, Clement of Alexandria, Athanasius, Theodoret and others who write against the Gentiles laugh at the pagans because they worship wood and stones as God. And what is that which Horace says in Book I, Sermon, Satire 8:

"Once I was a fig tree trunk, a useless wood, When the craftsman, uncertain whether to make a stool or Priapus, Preferred that I be a god."

Not only poets, but also the wisest men felt this; for Hermes Trismegistus in Augustine Book VIII On the City of God chapter 23 says that some gods were made by the supreme God, others in-

deed by men: but he says the gods made by men are statues to which by a certain magical art demons are bound, so that the statue is as it were the body of the god, but the spirit enclosed is the soul, and the whole idol is god, just as body and soul is man. And Arnobius in Book I Against the Gentiles: "I venerated," he says, "O blindness, recently images just brought forth from furnaces, gods made on anvils and fabricated from hammers." And below: "As if present power were within, I flattered, I spoke to, and I sought benefits from them." And below: "I believed gods to be wood, stones, bones, or to dwell in the matter of such things."

See therefore, Reader, whether Calvin does not lie when he denies that the pagans held idols as gods.

But he says the pagans changed images at will, yet did not change gods. I respond that the pagans, by the same stupidity by which they thought some gods could be made by human hands, could also believe that some gods could be destroyed by human hands.

But again Calvin says they placed many images for one god. I respond that the pagans had some gods in heaven, others on earth: nor did they think it absurd if one celestial god, like Jupiter or Apollo, had many lesser colleagues on earth, that is, many idols of the same name.

Finally Calvin adds that the pagans consecrated new images, yet did not think they were making new gods. I respond that it is false that the Gentiles did not think they were making new gods, at least terrestrial ones.

CHAPTER 13

The fifth falsehood is in Book I of the Institutes chapter II §10: "The prophets," he says, "everywhere did not cease to reproach Jews and Gentiles for fornications with wood and stone, only on account of those things which are done daily by those who wish to be held as Christians, namely that they carnally venerated God in wood and stone."

This is the greatest and most pernicious falsehood. For in the first place, Jews and Gentiles sacrificed to idols, as is evident concerning the Jews from Exodus XXXII and elsewhere, concerning the Gentiles from I Corinthians X and elsewhere, and Scripture calls this fornication. But Christians never sacrificed to images.

Moreover, Jews and Gentiles either thought idols were gods, as we have shown, or certainly in idols they worshipped creatures as God, which Christians do not do. That the Gentiles worshipped creatures as gods in idols is proved; for very many in images worshipped dead men as gods, whom they themselves believed to be dead, but did not easily dare to say this to the peoples. Lactantius proves this in Book I chapters 14 and 15, where he also relates that Cicero attempted to make his Tulliola a goddess by erecting an image to her. And Augustine in Book VIII chapter 26 On the City of God proves that the gods of the pagans were men, and in Book XVIII chapter [26] he teaches that the image of Serapis with finger placed to mouth was accustomed to indicate that it should be kept silent that Serapis had been a man, indeed he says capital punishment was established for those who would say Serapis had been a man, although it was established that he had truly been a man, and had died and been buried. The same is proved by Cypri-

an at the beginning of the book On the Vanity of Idols, and Eusebius On the Preparation of the Gospel Book II chapter 7, and Tertullian in Apologeticus chapter 11.

Others worshipped not dead men but demons in idols as gods, as is evident from Hermes in Augustine Book VIII On the City of God chapter 23. Although demons not only when invited by magical arts, as Hermes says, but even of their own accord dwelt in idols and substituted themselves for dead men, so that they might be adored in their place, as teach Blessed Cyprian at the beginning of the book On the Vanity of Idols, and Blessed Augustine Book VIII On the City of God chapter 24 and Book XXII Against Faustus chapter 17, and the same is evident from the fact that demons assumed for themselves the names either of idols in which they resided or of dead men in whose place they were worshipped. For when adjured and asked their name, some say they are called Beelzebub, some Moloch, some Chemosh etc., others Jupiter or Mercury or Apollo etc., as Origen observed in Book VI Against Celsus a little before the middle, Eusebius Book VI of the Preparation chapter 6, Lactantius Book II chapter 16, and Sulpicius in the Life of Blessed Martin. The same Scripture testifies when Deuteronomy XXXII says: "They sacrificed to demons and not to God." And Psalm XCV: "The gods of the gentiles are demons" etc. And I Corinthians X: "What the gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to demons and not to God" (7).

Others said they worshipped neither the image nor dead men nor demons in idols, but parts of the world; for in the idol of

---

7 Deut. XXXII, 17: Psal. XCV. 5: I. Cor. X. 20

Apollo they worshipped the Sun, in the idol of Jupiter the ether, etc., as Eusebius relates in Book III of the Preparation chapter 2, and Augustine on Psalm CXIII and Book IV On the City of God chapter 10, and Book VII On the City of God chapter 5 and following.

Others finally said they worshipped in idols neither the very corporeal parts of the world, but the souls of those parts, that is, of the Sun, Moon, Earth, etc., as Eusebius relates in Book III chapter 3 of the Preparation and Augustine in the place cited. But all these, as is evident, worshipped creatures for the creator: unless someone is so foolish as to deny that dead men, demons, elements, stars are creatures. Therefore Scripture reproaches this in the pagans, that they adored creature for creator. Which indeed Catholics neither do nor ever did, since they think images are neither gods nor images of gods.

CHAPTER FOURTEEN
THE SECOND ARGUMENT IS RESOLVED

To the second argument from the Councils, I say first that the two Constantinopolitan Councils were illegitimate. This is evident first, because the Roman Pontiff was not present either in person or through legates, as is clear from Zonara, Cedrenus, Paul the Deacon, and from the Second Nicene Synod, act. 6. Furthermore, it is an ecclesiastical rule from the First Nicene Council that general councils may not be celebrated without the judgment of the Roman Pontiff, as Socrates reports among others, lib. II. c. 13. Second, because no Patriarchs consented either in person or through legates, as is evident from the same authors. Third, because all authors who write about general councils, such as Psellus, Photius, Zonara, Nicephorus, Cedrenus, Nicetas, Paul the Deacon, Rheginо, Ado, Sigebert, Abbot of Ursperg, and others, either do not count these Constantinopolitan Councils among the Councils of the Church, or openly censure them.

I say second, even if they had been legitimate, nevertheless they were derogated by a plenary and truly general council, that is, the Second Nicene.

It should be noted here that this Constantinopolitan Council is falsely called the Third Ephesian by many recent writers, such as by the one who published the Councils in a certain admonition prefixed to the VII Synod and by the author of the summary of Councils at the beginning of the VII Synod, by Sixtus Senensis lib. V. Bibliotheca sancta annotat. 247, and by others. The cause of the error was that Theodosius, Bishop of Ephesus, presided over this profane council. For that it was truly held not at Ephesus, but at Constantinople, is evident from all the ancient historians, and from the council itself, which is contained in act. 6 of the Nicene Council.

It should be noted second, that Calvin and the Magdeburgers impudently praise the aforesaid Constantinopolitan Council; for although that council thought impiously about images, nevertheless it thought correctly about the cult and invocation of Saints, and about the merits of works, and pronounced anathema on those who teach what Calvin and the Magdeburgers now teach. For can. 15 anathematizes those who do not invoke Blessed Mary; can. 17 those who do not venerate and do not invoke the other Saints; can. 18 those who do not believe that God will render eternal life for the merits of works according to the just balance of his judgment. These canons are contained inserted in the Second Nicene Council, act. 6, and the Magdeburgers faithfully recite the same ones Centur. VIII. cap. 9, from which surely can be perceived their incredible either stupidity or impudence, who praise that by which they are anathematized.

CHAPTER 14

Concerning the Council of Frankfurt, on which the adversaries chiefly rely, I say three things. First, whatever that Council defined is not to be greatly regarded; for without doubt the Second Nicene Council is to be preferred to it, which is certain to have been more universal, more ancient, and without controversy approved by the Supreme Pontiff; for it is established from the council itself that legates of Pope Adrian were present, and again it was approved by Leo III, as is evident from Ivo, IV part, cap. 147.

I say second, if what the Centuriators say in Centur. VIII. cap. 9. col. 639 is true, that Synod does not harm us at all; for they themselves say that Adrian and his legates did not consent to the Frankfurt Synod, but opposed it. But it is certain that a Synod which the Roman Pontiff opposes is of no authority, as is evident both from Gelasius in the tome on the bond of anathema, and from experience. For no Synod has ever been held legitimately which the Roman Pontiff opposed.

What is more, the Frankfurt Synod itself teaches this very thing? For (as is evident from the Carolingian books,) the Frankfurt Synod decreed that the ultimate judgment of controversies belongs to the Roman Pontiff, and it refutes the VII Synod with this principal argument, because it considered it celebrated without the authority of the Roman Pontiff: Therefore the Frankfurt Synod, by the testimony of the Magdeburgers, destroys itself.

Moreover, in the same place the Magdeburgers say that the Nicene Synod was confirmed by Adrian: but the Frankfurt Council disapproves of a Synod made without the Pope's authority, therefore by the judgment of the Magdeburgers it is not our Nicene, but

some other one, which is disapproved in the Frankfurt Council. Finally, in the same place the Magdeburgers teach that in the Frankfurt Synod it was not defined that images should be removed from temples, but that they should indeed remain in temples, but not be adored. Why therefore do they themselves remove images from temples? Why do they break them? Why do they not observe the Frankfurt decree? From this is also refuted the lie of the Apology of the English, which teaches that in the Frankfurt Council it was decreed that images should be destroyed. But on the contrary, the Frankfurt Synod, by the testimony of the Carolingian books, of Hincmar, and of the Magdeburgers themselves, pronounced anathema on those who wish to destroy images. Moreover, the matter itself shows the same thing; for if that Synod had established this, why was it not done? For who would resist in the Western Church a decree of all the Bishops and a most powerful King? But that it was not done is most certainly certain: for no historians report it. Indeed, Jonas of Orleans reports as a new and sacrilegious thing that Claudius of Turin wished to destroy images in his diocese.

Third, I say that it is most uncertain what was established about images in the Frankfurt Synod. For the ancient authors are not consistent with themselves, for first the Frankfurt decree itself, which is cited in the preface of the Carolingian books, testifies that in the Frankfurt Synod was condemned the Synod which had convened at Constantinople and had ordered images to be adored. Where when it names Constantinople, it seems to speak of the Synod of heretics against images; but when it says that there it was

decreed that images should be adored, it seems to speak of the Synod of Catholics.

By similar reasoning the Carolingian books themselves say that in the Frankfurt Synod was condemned the Synod which had been made at Constantinople in Bithynia without the Pope's authority for adoring images. Where when it names Constantinople, and says that the Pope's authority was absent from the Synod, it seems to speak of the Synod of heretics: But when it says in Bithynia, and that that Synod was celebrated for images, it seems to speak of our Nicene. For Nicaea is the metropolis of Bithynia, but Constantinople is in Thrace.

Now truly Hincmar of Rheims cap. 20, book against Hincmar of Laon, who had flourished almost at that very time, says that in the Frankfurt Synod was condemned the Synod which had convened at Nicaea without the Pope's authority. Where he also joins two contrary things together, as is evident. Aimoinus lib. IV. cap. 85, concerning the deeds of the Franks, and Abbot of Ursperg in the Chronicle of the year 793 write that in the Frankfurt Synod was condemned the VII Synod of the Greeks, which had convened at Constantinople under Constantine and Irene, where they also join contraries among themselves.

But many more recent historians say that in the Frankfurt Synod was condemned the Synod about removing images, which the Greeks called the VII general. Thus Platina in the life of Adrian, Blondus decade II lib. I, Sabellicus lib. VIII. Ennead 8, Paul Aemilius lib. II concerning the deeds of the Franks. Because of this confusion, Alan Copus Dialogue 4 and 5 teaches that in the Frank-

furt Synod only the heretical Constantinopolitan Synod was condemned: but the Nicene was not only not condemned, but even confirmed, which opinion I would wish to be true, but nevertheless I suspect it to be false. First, because those Carolingian books, although they are falsely inscribed to Charles, as we shall say, nevertheless were without doubt written in the time of Charles, as is evident from the refutation of the same books, which Adrian I published, and they seem to have been written in the Frankfurt Council, and to contain the acts of the Frankfurt Synod. For Hincmar, an author of that time, asserts this, and the books themselves present this: but that the Synod which is refuted in these books is truly the Second Nicene cannot be doubted, if either the books themselves or Adrian's response are read.

Second, because all the ancient authors agree on this, that in the Frankfurt Council was disapproved the VII Synod which had decreed that images should be adored. Thus Hincmar, Aimoinus, Rhegino, Ado, and others teach everywhere. But to say that we all lie, or that their books are corrupted, as Copus says, seems to me rather harsh.

Third, because if these authors were speaking of the false VII Synod, that is, of the Constantinopolitan Synod against images, certainly they would also have remembered in their histories the truly seventh Nicene Synod. But they do not remember any VII Council, except this one, which they say was disapproved.

Nor does it matter that the Carolingian books, and Abbot of Ursperg, and Aimoinus say that the Synod held at Constantinople was disapproved; for the Abbot followed the Carolingian books,

as did Aimoinus: but the author of those books either by lapse of memory, or from ignorance put Constantinople for Nicaea; for otherwise when he says the Synod was celebrated in the province of Bithynia, where Nicaea is, not Constantinople, he sufficiently indicates that he speaks of Nicaea. And similarly the Abbot, and Aimoinus when they say the Synod was celebrated under Constantine and Irene, clearly demonstrate that they speak of the Nicene Synod, even if through error they name Constantinople. Nor does it matter that Hincmar and the Carolingian books say that the Synod disapproved in the Frankfurt Council was assembled without the Pope's authority, which is false about the Nicene, and true about the Constantinopolitan: For Hincmar followed the Carolingian books, as he himself indicates. But the author of those books fabricated this lie with many others, in order to deceive the Frankfurt Synod, as we shall soon say. Nor finally does it matter that Platina, Blondus, Sabellicus and Paul Aemilius say that the Synod about removing images was disapproved; for first all these are more recent. Then what they say does not conflict with the sayings of the ancient historians; for in the Frankfurt Synod two Synods were disapproved, namely the Constantinopolitan against images, and the Nicene for images, as is evident from the Carolingian books, and from Hincmar. And perhaps this is the cause why some of the ancient historians name Nicaea, some Constantinople, when they say the Synod of the Greeks was disapproved in the Frankfurt Council. It seems therefore to me that in the Frankfurt Synod the Second Nicene Synod was truly disapproved, but through error and materially, in exactly the way that formerly the Synod of Rimini con-

demned the homoousios. For the author of the Carolingian books deceived the Synod, and thrust two lies upon it: One lie was that in the Nicene Synod it had been defined that images should be adored with the cult of latria. The other, that that decree was made by the Greeks without the consent of the Roman Pope.

With these two lies held as truth, the Frankfurt Synod disapproved, and deservedly, the Nicene Synod as profane and illegitimate. That those two things were persuaded to the Council is evident from the Carolingian books themselves; for in the preface it is expressly stated in this way: "There was brought into the midst (namely in the Frankfurt Synod) the question of the new Synod of the Greeks, which they made at Constantinople about adoring images, in which it was written that whoever did not render service or adoration to the images of Saints just as to the Divine Trinity, should be judged anathema: which our most holy Fathers above, refusing in every way to render prayer and service to them, condemned, and consenting they condemned." This is there. In the work itself also Constantine Bishop of Constantia of Cyprus is introduced in the Nicene Council pronouncing anathema on those who do not adore images with that cult with which the most holy Trinity is adored. Behold clearly the first lie. The same author clearly teaches that the ultimate judgment of controversies of faith belongs to the Supreme Pontiff, and therefore that Synod for adoring images is worth nothing, because it lacks the Pontiff's authority.

Moreover, those ancient authors, who say that the false Synod was disapproved, which had decreed that images should be adored, without doubt understand by that "adored," adored with

the cult of latria; for they themselves also teach that images should be venerated, and yet they execrate that Synod which commands images to be adored. Ado in the Chronicle of the year 696 says that at Rome on the day of the exaltation of the Cross, the cross was accustomed to be kissed and adored by all the people. And in the Chronicle of the year 717 he calls venerable the image which Philippicus the heretic had overturned, and Theodosius the Catholic Emperor had restored. Rhegino lib. I of the Chronicle toward the end, acknowledges the adoration of the cross, and calls the destruction of images done by Leo the Iconoclast a crime. John Aventinus lib. IV of the annals says that when Charles the Great was designated Emperor, his image in the temple was venerated by all the people in his presence. Abbot of Ursperg in the Chronicle inveighs against Leo the Isaurian and Constantine Copronymus because of the destruction of images, and calls them impious and precursors of Antichrist, and on the contrary praises Pope Gregory and says he was a holy man, who excommunicated the Emperor because of the images of Christ and the Saints.

But that these are truly lies, that the Nicene Synod lacked the Pope's authority, and that it decreed images should be adored with the cult of latria, is most certain; for in the Second Nicene Council itself, act. 2, the letters of Pope Adrian for images are recited, and in all the actions the Roman Legates always subscribe first. Then as to what pertains to cult, in the first action Basil of Ancyra who previously had been a heretic, when he came to his senses and published a Catholic confession, with the whole Council hearing and approving said that he indeed venerates images, but

not with latria, since that is owed to God alone. Similarly Constantine Bishop of Constantia of Cyprus spoke in the VII Synod act. 3. Similarly the others also speak in act. 4 and 7.

Nor should it seem surprising that the author of the Carolingian books thrust such manifest lies upon the Frankfurt Synod about the Nicene Synod held a little before; for if now the Magdeburgers and Calvin dare to write that we venerate images with divine honors plainly as Gods, when so many books of Catholics, and the general Latin Council itself, celebrated at Trent within the borders of Germany, cry out the contrary expressly: what wonder if the same was fabricated about the Greek Synod, which very few could read, and which had been celebrated in the East?

If you say, therefore at least the Frankfurt Council, which was very well attended and legitimate, could err. I respond, it could err and did err, not in a question of law, but of fact. And moreover it is not surprising if it could err; for the Roman Legates did not consent, as the Magdeburgers say: but the Pope not only did not consent, but also refuted the Frankfurt decree, as is evident from Adrian's book on images to Charles, where all the lies of those Carolingian books are refuted.

CHAPTER FIFTEEN
THE THIRD ARGUMENT IS RESOLVED

But as to what they adduce from the books of Charles, in which they establish the principal foundation of their cause, I say that those books are neither Charles's, nor of such a kind that any faith can be placed in them.

That they are not Charles's is proved first, because there exists a book of Pope Adrian I to Charles, in which those books are accurately refuted; from which book of Adrian it is clearly understood that those books were composed by some heretic, and sent by Charles to the Pontiff, so that he might respond to them. That this book which exists in the third tome of the Councils is Adrian's can be understood both from other sources, and also from Ivo; who transferred many things from this book in the name of Adrian into the IV part of his decree.

Second, it is established from the histories of Greeks and Latins, such as Zonara and Cedrenus in the life of Leo the Isaurian, as well as Paul the Deacon in the life of the same, that the Roman Pontiffs, Gregory III, Adrian I, and Leo III departed from the Greek Emperors, excommunicated them, prohibited tributes to be

paid to them from Italy, placed themselves under the protection of the Franks, and finally transferred the Empire to them, chiefly for this cause, that the Greek Emperors patronized the heresy of the Iconoclasts, while on the contrary the Kings of the Franks were constant in the ancient faith: How therefore is it likely that Charles the Emperor labored under the same heresy, and wrote for the error of the Greeks against the Roman Pontiff? But let us hear the words of Zonara. "Therefore," he says, "Pope Gregory, having deserted obedience to the Emperor because of his perverse opinion, made peace with the Franks, when previously he had often given attention to recall Leo from the hatred of God through letters, and to reduce him to the cult of sacred images." And below in the life of Irene: "When Adrian, Pope of old Rome, died, Leo was substituted, a reverend and honorable man, who when he had betaken himself to Charles King of the Franks, from that time the Franks possessed Rome, with Charles crowned by Leo, and called Emperor of the Romans; for Pope Gregory wanted to have nothing to do with the impious governors of the Constantinopolitan Church, and made peace with the Franks."

Third, Jonas of Orleans writes lib. I on the cult of images (but Jonas flourished in the time of Louis the Pious, son of Charles) that Claudius of Turin, patron of that heresy, during the whole time that Charles lived, never dared to mutter, and the same there calls Charles Augustus a man most pious and of holy memory. If therefore the Iconoclasts, while Charles lived, did not dare to preach their heresy; if the defenders of images venerated Charles

as pious and holy, what impudence is it to attribute books against images to Charles?

Fourth, Paul Aemilius writes lib. II hist. of the Franks, as well as Rhegino in the Chronicle, that in a certain council assembled at Gentilly, King Pepin, father of Charles the Great, confuted the error of the Greeks against sacred images in the presence of legates of the Greek Emperor. From the same Paul it is also established that not long afterward Charles the Great sent twelve Bishops, from the chief ones of the kingdom, to the Council which Pope Stephen celebrated at Rome against the same error of the Greeks. With what audacity therefore do the adversaries attempt to transform a most Christian Prince into an Iconoclast? especially when the Magdeburgers agree with Paul Aemilius in this part Cent. VIII. cap. 9. col. 570.

Fifth, it is established from all historians, and from the letters and poems of Charles himself, indeed from the deeds themselves, that Charles and Adrian were always most closely united. There still exists Adrian's epitaph described by Emperor Charles no less elegantly than piously with Platina, whose beginning is this: "Here the father of the Church, glory of Rome, illustrious author, Blessed Pope Adrian has rest. A man whose life was God, piety his law, glory Christ: An Apostolic Pastor, ready for every good." And below: "After his father, Charles weeping wrote these verses, You were my sweet love, now I mourn you, father. Be mindful of me, my mind follows you always, While you hold the blessed kingdoms of heaven with Christ." Is it therefore credible that Charles was of a different religion and faith than Adrian? and that he wrote so bit-

terly against that same Adrian, when he honored him so greatly, and praised him after death?

Finally it is certain that Charles was a man skilled in Greek and Latin, prudent, and ingenious; but these books seem to be of a barbarous, ignorant, frivolous, and almost stupid man. For he says that Constantinople, a most well-known city, is in Bithynia, when no one does not know it is in Thrace, unless perhaps, because frequent earthquakes happen there, the ground has changed. Then he asserts that the Council for the cult of images was celebrated at Constantinople, when nevertheless no one who has read anything does not know it was celebrated at Nicaea: and what is more serious, these books through calumny and lying attribute many things to the Nicene Fathers which they never said, and sometimes what the adversaries had said; such as that the Eucharist is an image of the body of Christ; which not only do the Nicene Fathers not defend, as this author dreams, but they also expressly refute. Whence Calvin received the occasion for another lie. Because the Iconoclasts had said that only one image should be adored, that is, the Eucharist, and Pseudo-Charles had attributed this saying to the Nicene Synod, it pleased Calvin to change the whole matter thus, and to say: "But lest his play lack its customary applause, a clause is added (namely by the Nicene Council) let those rejoice and exult, who having the image of Christ, offer sacrifice to it." Which is a most impudent lie. For the Nicene Council is so far from wanting sacrifice to be offered to images, that it expressly declared in the seventh action that not true latria, but only honorary adoration is given to images.

Let it be added finally, that this book like another Melchizedek, is without father, without mother, without genealogy; for it appeared suddenly into the light, and it is not known when, or where, or how, or by whom it was found; and it has no name of author, nor of printer, nor of place where it was printed. All of which are proofs and indications of fraud.

But let it be, let the book be of Charles the Great, what finally will the adversaries obtain? Absolutely nothing. For the author of this book expressly opposes almost all the dogmas of the Calvinists; for he openly teaches that the ultimate judgment of controversies of faith belongs to the Roman Pontiff, and that he has primacy not from Councils, but from God himself. The same wants exorcism to be used in Baptism, temples to be dedicated with a certain rite, prayer to be made for the dead, Saints to be invoked, relics to be venerated, the use of Chrism, blessed water, and salt to be retained in the Church, that in the Eucharist there is truly the body of Christ, and that it should be adored, and offered as a true and proper sacrifice, which are all proven heresies among the adversaries. If therefore they want us to believe this author, when he teaches that the Nicene Synod erred, let them believe the same when he asserts so many things which we have now enumerated.

But even if it were established that Charles himself wrote this book, and agreed with the Calvinists in all things, what would they have other than the testimony of one lay man and soldier? Which to want to oppose to a general Council of Bishops is manifest foolishness. For, as Damascene rightly says orat. 2 on images,

CHAPTER 15

Christ did not commit the Church to Kings and Emperors, but to Bishops and Pastors.

CHAPTER SIXTEEN
THE FOURTH ARGUMENT IS RESOLVED

To the fourth argument from the testimonies of the Fathers, let us respond in order. Irenaeus lib. I. cap. 24 does not argue against Carpocrates because he had an image of Christ, but because he venerated it in the way that the gentiles venerate idols, namely with sacrifices, as Epiphanius heresy 27 and Augustine heresy 7 explain more clearly, and moreover because he had the image of Christ and Paul in the same place where he had images of Homer, Pythagoras, Plato and Aristotle. Epiphanius similarly heresy 79 reproves the Collyridians, not because they honored the image of the Blessed Virgin and the Virgin herself, but because they held her as a Goddess, and offered sacrifice to her.

Now when Ambrose says, in the oration on the death of Theodosius "Helena found the cross, she adored the King, not the wood surely which is the error of the Gentiles etc." He wants to say that the cross is not adored for itself, but for Christ, who hung on it. For although we honor the wood itself, nevertheless we do not honor it because it is wood, but because it represents Christ crucified. Whence Ambrose there says thus: "Helena acted wisely, who raised

the cross on the head of Kings, and placed it, so that the cross of the Lord might be adored in Kings."

Furthermore, when Jerome in cap. III of Daniel says that those who worship God ought not to adore statues, he speaks of statues of Kings, who were held as Gods, and whose statues were affected with divine honors. For he reproves those who do what the three boys refused to do in Babylon.

To the place of Augustine on the morals of the Church cap. 36, I say first, perhaps he speaks of idols of the gentiles, when he says: "I know adorers of pictures."

I say second, perhaps he speaks of certain ones who superstitiously venerated images of Saints, so as to approach idolatry; for that there were some Christians who adored images as Gods, Damascene testifies at the end of the book on heresies.

I say third, Augustine wrote that book in the beginnings of his conversion to the Catholic faith, and therefore offended by certain rites, he thought they savored of idolatry, whom nevertheless later better instructed he excused entirely from idolatry. Which we showed when we treated of relics; for in the same place he says that those who placed feasts upon the tombs of the dead were accustomed to offer feasts to cadavers, and thence he calls them adorers of sepulchers: and yet lib. VIII on the City of God cap. last he says that those who do this do not offer feasts to the dead, but only place foods upon the tombs of Martyrs, hoping that they are sanctified by God through the prayers of the Martyrs. To the places of Gregory I say, Gregory only reproves the superstitious cult of images, that is, by which images are venerated as Gods. As is evident

from the epistle to Secundinus lib. VII. epist. 53: "I know," he says, "that you do not seek the image of the Savior in order to worship it as God, but for the remembrance of the son of God to grow warm in his love etc." But that some veneration is owed to an image according to Gregory's opinion, is evident from lib. VII. epist. 5: "The image having been removed," he says, "which is worthy of veneration, and the cross etc."

CHAPTER SEVENTEEN
THE FIFTH ARGUMENT IS RESOLVED

To the fifth about the bronze serpent broken by Hezekiah; I respond that it is not surprising if Hezekiah did this. For the Hebrews were burning incense to it, as to God; for even if burning incense is not necessarily sacrifice, since we see in the Church even non-priests offering incense, and that not only to God, but also to the people: nevertheless in the old law it was not permitted except to a priest to burn incense, and therefore it seems to have been sacrifice then: see III Kings XII and II Chronicles XXVI.

Moreover the Hebrews, having forgotten the signification for which Moses had erected the serpent, honored it for its material, like other idols, that is, they thought the benefits of healings proceeded from the bronze serpent itself. For Hezekiah wanted to indicate this by calling the serpent נהשתן (Nehushtan) that is, "a piece of bronze," where the diminutive is placed through contempt; or, as some read נהשם (Nehasham) that is, "their serpent."

CHAPTER EIGHTEEN
THE SIXTH ARGUMENT IS RESOLVED

To Calvin's sixth argument, taken from experience, because Catholics more frequently visit one image than another of the same thing; and because they approach images when about to pray; and because they make pilgrimages to distant images, when they have more beautiful ones at home. From these facts he concludes that we believe divinity to be present in images.

I respond that one image is more frequently visited than another for various reasons. First, because God works miracles through one and not through another; which is also the reason why we more frequently petition one Saint in our prayers than another. Why God does this, however, is not for us to investigate.

The second reason is that certain images were painted by holy men, such as Luke, Nicodemus and others, while others were painted by secular persons. Certainly those images deserve special devotion which are holy not only because of their signification, but also because of their maker. In this category excelled the image of Edessa, which was believed to have been made by Christ himself; as well as the image of Saint Stephen, which is thought to have

been formed and brought by an Angel, concerning which Evodius writes in book II on miracles.

The third reason is that some images excite piety more than others, since they are more pious and religious, etc. Furthermore, we approach images when about to pray, not so that we may invoke the image, but so that the image may refresh our memory of the one whom we wish to pray to. Pilgrimages to images are rather rare in the Church; for ordinarily pilgrimages are made to relics and holy places, such as to the tomb of the Lord, to the thresholds of the Apostles, to Saint James, to the house of the Virgin at Loreto, etc. If some nevertheless make pilgrimages to images, they regard those three things which we have mentioned.

CHAPTER NINETEEN
THE SEVENTH ARGUMENT IS RESOLVED

To the seventh argument, to the first reason, that an image is not capable of honor, since it is an inanimate thing, and lacking sense and reason. I respond that from this is only proven that an image is not capable of honor on its own account, and therefore images are not honored absolutely, but relatively to their prototype (prototypum).

To the second I say that an image is holy for two reasons. First, because of its signification and representation of a holy thing: and in this way any image of Christ or of the Saints, even when existing in a workshop, can be honored.

Second, because of the Church's institution. For just as chalices, and vestments, and men themselves become sacred by the very fact that they are dedicated to divine worship and separated from profane use; so also images become sacred when they are placed by the Church in temples or other sacred places, not to feed the eyes of the curious, but to excite the memory and love of the Saints, and to serve the worship of sacred things. As a sign of this,

images are sometimes blessed and in some way consecrated by priestly prayers before they are placed in temples.

To the third I say. First, that man as the image of God is worthy of veneration, as we showed above from Cyril in catechesis 12 and Augustine in epistle 203. I say second, with Thomas Waldensis in tome III on sacramentals, title 19, chapter 154, that man is not proposed by the Church to be worshipped as the image of God, because there would be danger lest man be thought to be worshipped for his own sake; for man is also capable of honor for his own sake.

CHAPTER TWENTY
THE QUESTION IS PROPOSED: WITH WHAT KIND OF WORSHIP SHOULD IMAGES BE HONORED

I now come to the final question, namely with what kind of worship images are worthy. There are three opinions.

The first, that an image should not be worshipped in any way in itself, but only the exemplar should be worshipped before the image: so hold certain persons, whom Catharinus reports and refutes. The same seems to have been the view of Alexander, III part. question 30, final article, as well as Durandus book III of the Sentences, distinction 9, question 2, and Alphonsus a Castro under the word "Image." The foundation of this opinion is that according to Basil's view repeated often in the VII Synod, the honor of the image passes to the exemplar; therefore, these Doctors say, it does not terminate in the image: consequently the image itself is not what is honored, but only through it and in it the exemplar is honored. And this is confirmed from verses which are said to have been composed at the time of the VII Synod, and which are seen at Venice in the golden basilica carved in most ancient work, and are reported by Sabellicus in book VIII, Ennead 8.

"For God is what the image teaches, but not God itself: You may see this, but worship in mind what you perceive in it."

What is said of the image of Christ the God, could also be said of images of Saints, namely: "For Peter is what the image teaches, but not Peter himself," etc.

The second opinion is that the same honor is owed to the image and the exemplar, and therefore an image of Christ should be adored with the worship of latria, of Blessed Mary with the worship of hyperdulia, of other Saints with the worship of dulia. So hold Alexander, III part, question XXX, final article, Blessed Thomas III part, question XXV, article 3, and there Cajetan, Blessed Bonaventure, Marsilius, Almain, the Carthusian, Capreolus, and others in III distinction 9. The same also holds Henry in quodlibet 10, question 6, although he adds that no image should be adored with latria; for he indeed thinks that the honor is the same for image and exemplar, but at the same time teaches that an image of Christ is not an image of Christ as Christ is God, but as he is man.

The foundations of these authors are these. First, because the Church sings of the cross: "O cross, hail, our only hope, increase justice for the pious, and grant pardon to the guilty."

Second, because the honor of the image passes to the exemplar from Basil, therefore the honor of image and exemplar is the same; wherefore, if the exemplar is worshipped with latria, so is the image.

Third, from Ambrose, who in the book on the Sacrament of the Lord's Incarnation chapter 7 says that the divinity of Christ

and his cross are worshipped with the same adoration: "For," he says, "when we adore the image of God and the cross in Christ, do we divide him?"

Fourth, from Jerome in the epistle on the death of Paula: "Prostrate," he says, "before the cross, as if she beheld the Lord hanging, she adored." But she would have adored the hanging Lord with latria, therefore she also adored the cross itself with the worship of latria.

Fifth, from Aristotle, who in the book on memory and reminiscence says that there is the same movement toward the image, as it is an image, and toward the exemplar itself.

Sixth, the measure of adoration of any thing is the reason, or excellence, on account of which it is adored; but the reason why an image is adored is none other than the excellence of the exemplar, therefore exactly the same honor is owed to the image as is owed to the exemplar.

Seventh, he who treats the image of the King with insult is held guilty of lese majesty, as if he had treated the King himself with insult, therefore there is the same reason for the image and the exemplar with regard to honor and insult.

The third opinion stands in the middle, and belongs to those who say that images themselves should be honored in themselves and properly, but with lesser honor than the exemplar itself, and therefore no image should be adored with the worship of latria. So Martin Peresius in the book on traditions, in the treatise on images, likewise Ambrose Catharinus in the treatise on images, Nicholas Sanderus book II, final chapter on images. The same

seems to have been the view of Gabriel, who in III distinction 9, single question, and in the canon of the Mass, lecture 49, says that an image is adored with the same adoration as the exemplar, but not univocally, but analogically. For this is to say that images are worshipped with inferior worship than the exemplar itself.

For the solution of the question and the reconciliation of opinions, three distinctions must be noted. For that which is honored can be honored per se or per accidens: for its own sake or for the sake of another: properly or improperly. That is honored per se in which the reason for veneration inheres, per accidens that which is connected with the thing that is adored and is not itself the reason for adoration: as when a King is honored, that man who is King is honored per se, per accidens the purple and other things adjoined to him, and all his accidents, except the royal dignity, which although it is not that which is honored, is nevertheless that by which that man is honored. Therefore the person is honored per se, as that which; royal dignity is honored per se, as that by which; the rest are honored per accidens.

The second distinction: something can be honored for its own sake or for the sake of another. That is honored for its own sake which has in itself the reason for veneration, not depending on anything else; and in this way only rational nature is venerable. For the sake of another is honored that which indeed has in itself the cause of honor, but that entire cause depends on another, and in this way signs of sacred things are venerable; for they have in themselves a relation of likeness, or representation of a sacred

thing, and therefore a certain excellence, but that entire excellence depends on the sacred thing itself.

The third distinction: something can be honored properly or improperly. That is said to be honored properly which is truly honored by reason of itself. That is said to be honored improperly which is honored in place of another. A King's ambassador is sometimes honored as ambassador, and then he himself is properly honored, although he is honored for the sake of another: sometimes he is honored in place of the King with honor proper to Kings, and then he himself is improperly honored; but the King is then properly honored in him. This appears more clearly when one takes possession for another; or when a funeral is celebrated in the absence of the body, around a statue, and all things are done toward the statue which would be done around the body, as when sometimes, as Sextus Aurelius Victor testifies, Trajan triumphed dead at Rome, and his statue sat in his place in the triumphal chariot. For it cannot be said that the statue properly triumphed, but Trajan as represented by the statue.

CHAPTER TWENTY-ONE
IMAGES SHOULD BE WORSHIPPED PER SE AND PROPERLY

Now according to the distinctions laid down, we shall explain the whole matter in several propositions. Let this therefore be the first proposition: Images of Christ and the Saints should be venerated not only per accidens or improperly, but also per se and properly, so that they themselves terminate veneration as considered in themselves, and not only as they take the place of the exemplar. This is proved first, because the VII Council, act 7, defined that images of Christ should be venerated, but not with latria; therefore it wishes them to be venerated per se and properly with some worship: for if the Council only wished images to be adored per accidens or improperly, so that the proper terminus of adoration would not be the image but Christ himself, it would not say they should not be adored with latria; for Christ is adored with latria, since he is God.

Nor does it matter that some say an image of Christ does not represent Christ as God, but Christ as man, and therefore in an image of Christ, Christ cannot be adored as God, but Christ as

man: For an image of Christ represents Christ himself, that is, the divine hypostasis clothed with human flesh: just as an image of any man represents not only the figure and color, but also the person and the whole man himself. Otherwise the Apostles seeing Christ in the flesh should not have adored with latria; nor should Thomas have said: "My Lord and my God." For they did not see Christ as God, but as man.

Second it is proved, for if an image is not venerable except improperly, because namely before it, or in it, or through it the exemplar is adored, certainly it will be permissible to simply deny that images are venerable. For what is said only improperly can be simply denied, as is evident: but the VII Council, act 7, pronounces anathema on those who deny that images are venerable.

Third, the same Council there defines that images should be venerated in the way in which we venerate the Gospels and sacred vessels: But these are honored per se and properly, as all confess, for they do not bear the person of another: therefore images also should be venerated per se and properly.

Fourth, in the image itself there is truly something sacred, namely likeness to a sacred thing, and the dedication itself, or consecration to divine worship; therefore they are worthy of honor in themselves, and not only as they take the place of prototypes.

Nor do the objections adduced above convince. To the first I say that images, whether they are honored properly, or per se, or per accidens, are always honored on account of the exemplar, and their honor always passes to the exemplar, but in one way or another; for when an image is adored improperly, because namely

honor does not terminate in it, but passes through it to the exemplar, then immediately and formally the honor of the image passes to the exemplar. But when an image is honored per se and properly, so that honor truly terminates in it, then its honor passes to the exemplar not immediately, but mediately, and as it were consequently; for he who honors the image of someone undoubtedly honors on account of him whose image it is, and therefore honor truly exhibited to the image redounds to the prototype. Just as he who gives alms to a poor person is said to have given it to Christ, not because the alms does not immediately tend toward the poor person, but because he who gives alms to the poor person does so on account of Christ, and honors Christ in the poor person.

To the second I say that by those verses is only taught that the same honor which is owed to the exemplar should not be owed to the image, as is evident from the reason which is given in those same verses. Because namely the image is not God, but the image of God. For from this it follows that the honor owed to God should not be owed to the image, but a lesser one. But we here do not assert the same honor, but some honor is owed to the image. And perhaps the authors of the first opinion wished to say only this, namely that the proper honor of the exemplar cannot be exhibited to the image except improperly; but they said nothing about inferior honor. If this is so, we do not disagree with them.

CHAPTER TWENTY-TWO
IT SHOULD NOT BE SAID THAT THE WORSHIP OF LATRIA IS OWED TO IMAGES

Second proposition: "As regards the manner of speaking, especially in preaching to the people, it should not be said that any images should be adored with latria, but on the contrary that they should not be so adored." This is proved first. Councils do not affirm, but simply deny that images are adored with latria, therefore we also ought to speak in the same way; for the manner of speaking of Councils is the manner of speaking of the Church, and therefore should be followed by those who do not wish to err. Moreover, that Councils do not assert, but deny that images should be adored with the worship of latria is proved; for first, there is no Council which asserts that the worship of latria is owed to images; then the Second Council of Nicaea, act 7, declares that images should be adored, but not with latria. Similarly in our time the Council of Sens chapter 14 and the Council of Mainz chapter 41 say that preachers ought to warn the people not to adore images; which is undoubtedly understood of the adoration of latria.

They will perhaps say: These Councils speak of latria which is exhibited to something for its own sake, not of that which is exhibited to something for the sake of another. But this makes no difference to the matter; for here we are dealing not with meaning, but with words; it is enough for us that in the Councils it is simply denied that latria is owed to images; for we ought to follow the manner of speaking of the Councils.

Second, there are no more exact formulas of speaking in matters of faith than those which are used by those who abjure heresy: But in the VII Synod act 1, Basilius of Ancyra, and act 3, Constantine Bishop of Cyprus, abjuring heresy say that they receive and worship images, but not with latria.

Third, the Fathers everywhere say that images should not be adored, as is evident from Augustine epistle 149, chapter 11: "It is forbidden," he says, "that any likeness of God in human contrivances be worshipped, not because God does not have an image, but because no image of his should be worshipped, except that one which is what he himself is." Likewise from Gregory, who in book VII epistle 109 and book IX epistle 9 warns Serenus the Bishop to instruct the people not to adore images, and repeatedly says that images should not be adored. But certainly they speak of the adoration of latria; for otherwise they do not deny that images are venerable. Moreover John Damascene in book I and III of his Apology repeatedly says that images should be honored, but in no way with latria. Pope Adrian I in his epistle to Charlemagne, final canon, which epistle is found in the volumes of Councils after the Second Synod of Nicaea incomplete, but is found more complete

among the epistles of Pontiffs recently published at Rome, teaches and repeats in many words that images should be honored with the worship with which we honor the sacred Scriptures, but not worshipped with the worship with which we worship God. The same holds John of Orleans in his book on the worship of images. Why therefore, I ask, do we not speak as our Fathers speak?

Fourth, to tell the people that an image of Christ or the cross should be adored with the worship of latria, with that very worship with which God is adored, is not without great danger; For those who defend that images are adored with latria are compelled to use most subtle distinctions, which they themselves scarcely understand, much less the unlearned people.

Fifth, this manner of speaking offends the ears of Catholics and provides occasion for heretics to blaspheme more freely.

Sixth, according to the truth of the matter (as I shall show shortly) it cannot be said that images are adored with latria, except per accidens or improperly; but per se and properly, in no way. And besides, that adoration per accidens or improper is very rarely exercised. For the ordinary adoration is that which is exhibited to external images per se and properly. But what is said simply is not understood of that which befits a thing per accidens or improperly and sometimes, but of that which befits per se and properly and for the most part, therefore speaking simply it should not be affirmed, but denied that images are adored with latria. Moreover, it is very credible that Saint Thomas, Alexander of Hales, and other scholastic Doctors of that time had not seen the Second Synod of Nicaea, nor the eighth General Synod, nor the epistle of Pope

Adrian I in defense of the Synod of Nicaea. For all these things were hidden for a long time, and were first published in this our century, as can be known even from this, that in the somewhat older volumes of Councils none of these things exist, and Saint Thomas and other ancient scholastics never make any mention of this Synod of Nicaea.

CHAPTER TWENTY-THREE
IMAGES OF CHRIST CAN BE HONORED WITH THE WORSHIP OF LATRIA IMPROPERLY OR PER ACCIDENTS

Third proposition: "If we are dealing with the matter itself, it can be admitted that images can be worshipped improperly or per accidens with the same kind of worship with which the exemplar itself is worshipped."

And first, that an image can be worshipped improperly with the worship with which the exemplar itself is worshipped, is proved; For sometimes an image is taken for the exemplar itself, and those things which would be done around the exemplar itself, if it were present, are done around the image, with the mind nevertheless fixed on the exemplar. Thus preachers address the image of the crucifix and say to it: you redeemed us, you reconciled us to the Father; for these things are not said to the image, neither as it is wood, nor as it is an image, but as it is taken in place of the exemplar, that is, they are said to Christ himself, whose image nevertheless takes his place. Just as also on Good Friday when the crucifix is gradually uncovered and shown and proposed for adoration, all

those things are understood to be exhibited through the image to Christ himself truly. But then properly no honor is deferred to the image, but to the exemplar alone: nevertheless improperly it can be said that the image itself is also honored.

But that an image can be adored with the adoration of the exemplar itself, properly indeed, but per accidens, is proved; for sometimes we do not take the image for the exemplar, nor do we consider the image alone or the exemplar alone, but we consider the exemplar as it objectively shines forth in the image, and we venerate it thus represented and as it were clothed with the image: but then we necessarily adore the image with the same worship with which we adore the exemplar itself, but per accidens; for he who adores someone also adores all things which are connected with him. Just as he who adores a clothed king adores at the same time the king and the clothes; but the image is conceived at that time as connected with the exemplar which is adored; therefore it also is adored, per accidens however, because it is neither the subject which is adored, nor the reason for adoration, but a certain adjunct.

Moreover, this seems to have been the mind of the authors of the second opinion; for all of them, when they explain how an image is adored with the same adoration with which the exemplar itself is adored, always come at last either to improper adoration or to adoration per accidens. Alexander and Bonaventure clearly enough indicate that they speak of improper adoration. For they say that therefore an image of Christ is adored with the worship of latria, because not so much it, as Christ in it is adored.

Moreover Blessed Thomas and those who follow him are to be understood as speaking of adoration per accidens; for first this is proved by their argument concerning the unity of movement toward the image and toward the exemplar. For then there is the same movement toward the image and toward the exemplar, when the exemplar is considered as it objectively shines forth in the image, as we have said.

Then Capreolus expressly admits that this adoration of images is per accidens, in the way that the clothes of the King are adored when the clothed King is adored. Indeed Blessed Thomas himself in article 4 of the same question says that the image of the King is honored with royal honor just as the clothes of the King are; but it is certain that the clothes of the King are not honored with royal honor except per accidens.

Finally, the speculation of Cajetan tends to the same point, when he says that an image of Christ is adored with latria, not by reason of the matter, nor by reason of the form or figure, but by reason of actual representation; for he does not wish to say that that actual representation is the reason why the image is adored with latria: but he wishes to say that that representation is the condition by reason of which the image is conceived as connected with the exemplar, and therefore is adored per accidens.

CHAPTER TWENTY-FOUR
IMAGES PER SE AND PROPERLY SHOULD NOT BE WORSHIPPED WITH THE SAME WORSHIP WITH WHICH THE EXEMPLAR ITSELF IS WORSHIPPED

Fourth proposition: "An image per se and properly should not be adored with the same worship with which the exemplar itself is adored, and therefore no image should be adored with the worship of latria per se and properly." This is proved first from the VII Council act 7, where we read that an image of Christ should not be adored with latria. But this would be false if the same worship which is owed to the exemplar were owed to the image per se and properly, for Christ should be adored with the worship of latria.

You will say the Council speaks of adoration which is exhibited to a thing for its own sake; but the image is adored with latria, but for the sake of another. On the contrary; for the Council says that images are not adored otherwise than the book of the Gospels and sacred vessels are adored; which the VIII Synod repeats in the final act, canon 3. But no one ever said that the book of the Gospels or sacred vessels are adored with latria in any way.

Second it is proved from Augustine, Gregory, and Damascene, and from the Councils of Sens and Mainz cited above, where it is held that images should not be worshipped with divine worship.

You will say they speak of divine worship which is exhibited to something for its own sake. On the contrary; because there could be no doubt about this. But Councils define about those things which come into controversy.

Third, latria is worship proper to God, but no image per se and properly is God, whether it be considered by reason of matter, or by reason of figure and colors, or by reason of relation, therefore the worship of latria is not owed per se and properly to any image.

Someone will perhaps say that latria is worship proper to God when it is exhibited for its own sake, but not when it is exhibited for the sake of another. On the contrary; for it is of the essence of true latria that it be exhibited for its own sake; for latria is said to be the highest worship which is owed to the true God as the first principle of all things: But it involves a contradiction to exhibit the highest worship to the first principle and for the sake of another; For if to the first principle, then not for the sake of another; if for the sake of another, then not to the first principle. Therefore either worship of latria is exhibited to the image for its own sake, and this is true idolatry, or it is not exhibited for its own sake, and then it is not the worship of true latria.

Moreover, either this latria which is exhibited to the image for the sake of another is the same worship as that which is exhibit-

ed to God, or it is another lesser one; if the same, therefore the creature is worshipped equally with God himself, which is certainly idolatry; for idolatry is not only when an idol is adored with God abandoned, but also when an idol is adored together with God, Exodus XX: "You shall not make golden gods and silver gods with me" [1]. If it is lesser worship, then it is not latria. For latria is the highest worship.

Fourth reason: neither internal nor external worship of true latria befits an image; for internal worship is apprehension of a thing as first principle, and prostration of the will fitting to that apprehension; but the proper external act is sacrifice. But certainly we neither apprehend the image as first principle, nor do we sacrifice to it: therefore we do not adore it with the worship of latria.

Fifth reason: an image, as image, is opposed to the exemplar and is inferior to it, therefore it cannot be worshipped with the same worship, but with a lesser one; For each thing should be honored according to its dignity. But certainly it is far greater to be Christ than to be an image of Christ.

Sixth reason: those who worshipped an image of Christ with divine honors are numbered among heretics by Irenaeus book I chapter 24, Epiphanius heresy 27, Augustine heresy 7, and Damascene in the book on a hundred heresies at the end: But these, since they worshipped Christ, undoubtedly worshipped his image on account of him; therefore it is not permissible to worship images with divine honors, that is, with the worship of latria, even if someone should say he does this on account of God or Christ, not

[1] Exod. XX, 23.

on account of the images; for by the very fact that he worships them with divine honors, he is convicted of worshipping them on account of themselves, not on account of God, whatever he may say in words.

Finally let those most ancient verses be added: "For God is what the image teaches, not God," etc.

For they signify clearly enough that the worship owed to God should not be owed to the image.

From these things the arguments proposed can easily be answered.

To the first: "O cross, hail, our only hope," etc. I respond that either there the cross is taken for Christ crucified himself, as we have said, or it is a rhetorical prosopopeia, by which the Church addresses the cross in the way that Moses addresses heaven and earth when he says Deuteronomy XXXII: "Hear, O heavens, what I speak," etc., and when Blessed Andrew addressed the same, when he said "Hail, precious cross," etc. But we signify by this prosopopeia that we desire the fruit of the cross, that is, to be saved through the merit of Christ, who suffered on the cross.

To the second will be said below in the response to the fifth.

To the third I say that Ambrose understands by the cross the passion of Christ or his suffering flesh, just as by the image of God he understands the divinity. For he wishes to say that Christ is one, both God and crucified, and therefore when Christ God is adored, humanity is not separated from him; and when Christ crucified is adored, divinity is not separated.

To the fourth I respond that Jerome there does not say that the cross was properly adored by Paula, but that prostrate before the cross she adored Christ, whom she saw represented on the cross.

To the fifth concerning one movement toward the image and toward the exemplar, various solutions are given. Peresius responds that it is not true that we are moved by the same movement toward the image and the exemplar, since they are opposites and cannot be known except by two cognitions: He also says that what Blessed Thomas adduces is nowhere found in Aristotle. But certainly Aristotle in the book on memory and reminiscence chapter 2 seems to say this clearly; For when giving the reason why memory knows absent things, he says the cause is that in memory there are species of things which are like certain pictures, and if indeed a man contemplates those phantasms as they are certain things in themselves, he will not know past things, but will think of a present thing: But if he contemplates the same phantasms as they are images, then he will know past things of which they are images, because namely an image cannot be known as image without the thing of which it is an image being known at the same time. Nor is it true what Peresius says, that relatives, because they are opposites, cannot be known by one cognition; for they are so opposed that one depends on the other, and one cannot be defined or known without the other.

Durandus responds otherwise, for he admits that there is one movement of mind toward the image and toward the exemplar; but he denies that therefore there is also one adoration; for

although the mind knows both at the same time, nevertheless it does not say that one is the other, but understands them to be distinct, and therefore does not adore them with one and the same adoration.

Others confirm this solution, because although there is one movement of mind, that is, of the intellect toward the image and the exemplar, nevertheless there can be contrary movements of the will. For he who sees an image of Christ badly depicted hates the image as it is an image, and yet loves Christ; and conversely, he who sees an image of Judas beautifully expressed loves the image and hates the exemplar.

This solution does not satisfy; for Blessed Thomas does not say that the movement toward the image, as it is an image, is also toward the exemplar, but he says that the movement toward the image, as it is the image of another, is also toward the exemplar; and this is true both of the movement of intellect and of will. For he who loves an image of Christ, not because it is an image, but because it is an image of Christ, it is impossible that he should not at the same time love Christ, since Christ is the reason why he loves the image. But he who loves a beautiful image of Judas and hates Judas does not love that image as belonging to Judas, but as a beautiful image simply, that is, he delights in that proportion which exists between the image and the exemplar, not caring what kind of exemplar it is.

I think therefore that the answer should be different. And first, I admit that there is the same movement even of the will toward the image and the exemplar: but then either the exemplar is

conceived and adored as the principal object, or not, that is, either I conceive and adore Christ himself objectively shining forth in the image; or I conceive and adore the image itself as an image of Christ, so that Christ is placed obliquely, not directly. If the first, then the adoration is indeed of latria, but it is directed toward Christ per se, toward the image only per accidens: this seems to be what Capreolus and Cajetan wished for themselves. If the second, then the adoration is indeed directed toward the image per se and consequently toward Christ, but it is not adoration of true latria, but far inferior.

You will say: but true latria befits Christ, therefore if this adoration terminates also toward Christ, it will be of true latria. I respond that true latria befits Christ when he is adored as he is in himself, but not when he is adored as he is in the image by participation. Just as he who honors a servant of the King certainly honors the King himself; and yet he honors the King himself in his own person far differently than in his servant, as is known. And hence appears the response to the second: For when an image is honored, its honor passes to the prototype, but that honor is not such as is owed to the prototype in itself, but such as is owed to it as it is participated by the image.

To the sixth I say in the same way that the reason why an image is honored is the exemplar itself, but the exemplar should be honored in one way as it is in itself, in another way as it is participated by the image.

To the seventh, I respond that one who injures the statue of a king is punished as guilty of lèse-majesté, because he has truly

injured the king. However, I deny that he should be punished as severely as if he had injured the king himself. But if someone were in fact punished equally severely, this would occur only because it was clear that he did not injure the statue as the statue of the king, but instead took the statue to be the king himself.

CHAPTER TWENTY-FIVE
WHAT KIND OF WORSHIP SHOULD BE GIVEN TO IMAGES

Fifth Conclusion: The worship which is properly and per se owed to images is a certain imperfect worship, which analogically and reductively pertains to the species of that worship which is owed to the exemplar. I explain: To images there belongs properly neither latria, nor hyperdulia, nor dulia, nor any other of those worships which are attributed to intelligent nature. For an inanimate thing, devoid of reason, is not capable of such kinds of worship: but rather a certain inferior and varied worship according to the variety of images. Therefore, to images of Saints there is not properly owed dulia, but an inferior worship, which can be called dulia secundum quid (qualified dulia), or dulia analogically, or reductively. Similarly, to images of the Blessed Virgin there is not owed hyperdulia simpliciter (absolutely); but hyperdulia secundum quid (qualified hyperdulia), or analogically reductively. Finally, to images of Christ there is not owed true and absolute latria, but a worship incomparably inferior, which nevertheless is reduced to latria, as the imperfect to the perfect.

This is proven: as an image relates to its exemplar, so the worship of the image relates to the worship of the exemplar. But an image is the exemplar itself analogically and secundum quid (in a qualified sense); for a painted man is a man secundum quid and analogically. Therefore, to the image is also owed the worship owed to the exemplar itself, but imperfectly and analogically. Moreover, an image is reduced to the species of the exemplar; for a painted man and a painted horse differ in species, because a true man and a true horse differ in species. Therefore, the worship of an image is also reduced to the worship of the exemplar, and perhaps Blessed Thomas and Blessed Bonaventure, and others, wished to say only this when they said that image and exemplar are worshipped with the same worship; for Gabriel interprets their opinion in this way, and if this is so, we all agree.

From these considerations we also have what should be said concerning the true cross of the Lord, the nails, thorns, and other relics. For all these things are to be honored with lesser worship than Christ or the Saints whose relics they are, but nevertheless with such worship as analogically and reductively pertains to the species of worship by which Christ or the Saints are worshipped: for relics merit honor because by reason of contact, or in some other way, they have a relationship to those whose relics they are.

CHAPTER TWENTY-SIX
ON THE ADORATION OF THE CROSS

Although the Cross of the Lord is venerated partly among relics and partly among images (for that true cross on which the Lord hung, on account of its contact with the sacred body and blood, must be held among the most precious relics, not only in its entirety but also in its fragments; but that same cross, insofar as it represents the figure of the crucified Lord, and similarly other crosses like it, are numbered among sacred images), nevertheless, because particular errors and particular arguments concerning the cross are found, we have thought that a particular disputation concerning it should also be instituted.

There was therefore a heresy first of all of Claudius of Turin, who, besides other images, execrated the Cross of the Lord, as Jonas testifies in book I. Claudius lived in the year of the Lord 800. The same doctrine was taught at the same time in the East by the Paulicians, so called from a certain Paul, as Euthymius testifies in Panoplia part II, title 21.

Then around the year of the Lord 1130, there arose Peter of Bruys and Henry, who similarly attacked the Cross of the Lord

and its worship, as Peter of Cluny testifies, who wrote against them a lengthy and learned epistle to all the Bishops at that very time. Around the same time, or a little later, there arose in the East the Bogomiles, who taught the same things with the same arguments, as Euthymius testifies in Panoplia part II, title 23.

No less did the Wycliffites later detest the honor of the cross, according to Thomas Waldensis tome III, title 20. Calvin in book 1 of the Institutes chapter 11, §7. The Magdeburg Centuriators Century IV chapter 4, column 302, chapter 6, columns 458 and 459, where they also impudently lie that the use of the sign of the cross was new in the fourth century. For Tertullian in his book "On the Military Crown" mentions the sign of the cross, though he flourished in the second century. Just as also in Century VII chapter 6, column 191, they lie that Pope Sergius was the first author for the cross to be adored and kissed. For Pope Sergius sat in the year of the Lord 688. But Evagrius mentions the adoration and kissing of the cross in book IV chapter 26, who is a hundred years older than Sergius. Jerome also mentions it in his epistle to Marcella, that she should migrate to Bethlehem.

The arguments of the Bogomiles and Petrobrusians were three. First, because the cross brought pain and ignominy to Christ, therefore it should be detested by those who love Christ.

Second, because a son would be judged foolish and impious who would love and honor the gallows on which his father had been hanged.

Third, because if it is necessary to adore all crosses because Christ hung on a cross, it will also be necessary to adore all sepul-

chers because the Lord rested in a sepulcher; and all mangers because he was laid in a manger; and all columns, lances, sponges, scourges, etc. Indeed, even all donkeys (says Claudius) because Christ was carried on a donkey.

Fourth, Claudius argues that the enemies of Christ rejoiced about the passion of the Lord, they grieved about the resurrection and vice versa; his friends grieved about the passion, rejoiced about the resurrection; therefore those who honor the cross and love it imitate the enemies of Christ.

Fifth, the Wycliffites argued according to Waldensis: if we adore the cross by reason of contact, or because it was an instrument of the passion, it will also be necessary to adore the lips of Judas, which touched the mouth of the Lord by kissing, and the hand of that servant who touched the Lord when he struck him with a blow; for all these things touched the Lord and were instruments of the passion.

Sixth, the Centuriators argue that it is superstition to attribute virtue to characters; but the Papists attribute to the figure of the cross the power of driving away demons and all evils; therefore they are superstitious. These objections will be dissolved below in chapter 30. But first we will explain the matter. We will therefore say three things: First, about the cross itself. Second, about the image of the cross. Third, about the passing sign of the cross.

CHAPTER TWENTY-SEVEN
ON THE TRUE CROSS OF THE LORD

As to the first point, before I come to the proofs, certain things about the figure of the cross itself must be noted. It should be known therefore that the cross was made from three pieces of wood, of which one was long, to which the body adhered, another was transverse, placed above the long one, to which the hands were fastened, the third piece of wood was fixed into the long wood, so that the feet of the crucified could stand on it and nails could be driven. Irenaeus testifies to this in book II chapter 42: "The form," he says, "that is, the figure of the cross has five extremities and summits, two in length, two in width, one in the middle on which rests he who is fastened with nails." Justin also has this in the Dialogue with Trypho beyond the middle.

Whether the transverse wood was placed above the long wood so that the long wood did not project upward is not certain; for Bede in his questions on Genesis, where he speaks of Abraham's victory, says the cross was similar to a Greek letter, which Jerome teaches was also formerly the Hebrew Tau, as he teaches in chapter IX of Ezekiel. But Blessed Augustine in epistle 120 chapter

26 says that the long wood projected above the transverse. And this is more probable; for it is more conformable to the words of Irenaeus and to the words of the Apostle to the Ephesians chapter III, where, alluding to the figure of the cross, he names height, depth, length, and width. Moreover, those who say the cross was similar to the letter Tau speak truly, because it differed little.

But what Bede writes in his collections and flowers, that the cross was made from four kinds of wood, from Cedar, Pine, Cypress, and Boxwood, and what is written in the scholastic history about wood drawn from the sheep pool, etc., do not have the testimonies of the ancients, nor do they seem probable.

But this should not be ignored, that the ancients added something for the sake of mystery, which is even now partly preserved. For they extended the long wood upward and bent it in the manner of a pastoral staff, so that it would represent the Greek letter P (rho); a little below they placed two transverse pieces of wood in the likeness of the cross of St. Andrew, which would represent the Greek letter X (chi), so that those two letters by abbreviation would signify Christ; below that they placed the transverse wood which truly completes the cross, and from there hung an extended veil; below the transverse wood was the long wood in the likeness of a spear; to the lowest part they added a handle for the convenience of carrying. All these things signified that the cross was the standard of the Emperor Christ; for the cross was testified by the figure itself; the name of Christ was indicated by the two letters X and P; the banner was recognized from the veil, spear, and handle. See John Pierius Valerianus on hieroglyphic signs book L, and Pri-

masius book IV on the Apocalypse, where he calls this same sign a monogram and sign of Christ. The labarum of Constantine was also of nearly the same kind. For as Eusebius relates in book IX of his History chapter 9, the labarum, which was customarily carried before emperors and adored by soldiers, Constantine reduced to the form of a cross, yet in such a way that it did not lose the form of a banner.

Eusebius describes the labarum itself in book I of the Life of Constantine, where he says it was a spear entirely surrounded with gold, at whose summit was placed a most precious crown, below it a transverse beam in the form of a cross, from which hung a purple veil most ornately decorated with gold and gems, at whose lowest part were seen the images of Constantine and his sons. In the spear itself under the crown were the letters of the name of Christ.

Now the common method of crucifying was not, as many think, by binding with ropes, but by driving nails. Painters are accustomed to depict only Christ as fastened with nails, but the thieves and St. Peter with ropes. But it is not so, for all were fastened with nails, indeed all carried their own cross, and all were first beaten with scourges. See Plutarch on the slow vengeance of the divine; Marcus Tullius act. 7 against Verres; Nonius Marcellus at the word "Patibulum," who thus says: "Bound to the cross-beam they are carried around, then they are fastened to the cross." Macrobius book I Saturnalia chapter 11; Josephus book VI on the Jewish War chapter 12 and in his Life. In the book on the passion of St. Andrew, the Proconsul says: "On that very cross which you

praise, I command that you be fastened after being beaten." Moreover, when St. Andrew was to be crucified, beyond the ordinary manner, the same Proconsul ordered that they suspend him on the cross with ropes, lest fastened with nails he should quickly die. Add that therefore it was doubted which of the three crosses found was the Lord's cross, because all three had similar holes and nails, etc. See Rufinus book X History chapter 8.

These things therefore being noted beforehand, let us come to the arguments. And first, that the wood of the cross is venerable is proved by reason drawn from the Scriptures. For the Scriptures testify that Christ was not crucified by chance, or unwillingly, or because of his own sins, but that he himself freely chose the cross, and chose it as the altar of the supreme sacrifice by which God would be placated, as the ladder for himself to the kingdom, the instrument of liberation of the human race, and finally as the instrument by which he would conquer the Devil and triumph over him. From which it follows that that true cross was wonderfully honored by God and should be lovable and venerable to all of us.

That he freely chose it is clear from Isaiah chapter LIII: "He was offered because he himself willed it," John X: "I lay down my life, no one takes it from me, but I lay it down." In Acts of the Apostles chapter II: "Him, delivered up by the definite plan and foreknowledge of God, you killed." Acts III: "God, who foretold through the mouth of all the Prophets that his Christ should suffer, thus fulfilled it." Acts IV: "For truly in this city there were gathered together against your holy servant Jesus, whom you anointed, both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and the peoples of Is-

rael, to do whatever your hand and your plan had predestined to take place." (1)

That the cross was the altar of the supreme sacrifice is clear because Christ himself crucified was the supreme sacrifice, in the epistle to the Hebrews chapter VII. Whence to the Colossians I: "Making peace through the blood of his cross" (2), that is, through his blood poured out on the cross as on an altar. And this was signified by the stone erected and anointed and called the house of God by Jacob, Genesis XX.

That the cross was a ladder for Christ to the kingdom, John XII: "Now the ruler of this world will be cast out, and I, when I am lifted up from the earth, will draw all things to myself. He said this to show by what death he was to die." Philippians II: "He humbled himself, becoming obedient unto death, even death on a cross. Therefore God has highly exalted him," etc. (3)

That it was an instrument of liberation, many figures teach, which John Damascene collected in book IV on the Faith chapter 12. For this was signified by the tree of life in paradise, Genesis chapter II; the wooden ark of Noah saving his house, Genesis VII; the rod of Moses opening the sea, Exodus XIV; the wood making the waters sweet, Exodus XV. But especially the bronze serpent lifted up in the desert, Numbers XVIII, concerning which the Lord said in John III: "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, so must the Son of man be lifted up, that whoever believes in him

---

1 Isai. LIII, 7; Joan. X. 17 et 18; Act. II, 23; III, 18; IV, 27 et 28.

2 Coloss. I, 20.

3 Joan. XII, 31 et 32; Phil. II. 7 et 9.

may not perish but have eternal life." Hence indeed the Church, following Paul to the Galatians VI, says: "But far be it from us to glory except in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, in which is our salvation, life, and resurrection." [4]

That he conquered the Devil by the cross and triumphed over him is clear from the epistle to the Colossians II: "The handwriting of ordinances that was against us, he took it out of the way, nailing it to the cross; having disarmed principalities and powers, he made a public spectacle of them, triumphing over them in himself." [5] Origen in homily 8 on Joshua says that in the Greek it reads: "triumphing over them on the wood of the cross": and although we do not now have "on the wood" but ἐν αὐτῷ (in himself), nevertheless it can very well be referred to the cross, concerning which he had said above, τῷ σταυρῷ (to the cross), as Theophylact relates. Origen therefore says that on the cross two were fastened: Christ visibly, of his own will, and for a time; but the Devil invisibly, unwillingly, and for his eternal shame; and he proves this from this passage, where Paul uses the metaphor of triumph, wishing to indicate that the cross is the triumphal chariot, on whose highest part sits Christ triumphant, and on the lower part the Devil is dragged bound and displayed as if in a procession; for this is what the word ἐδειγμάτισεν εἰς θριαμβεύσας (he made a show of them, triumphing) signifies.

The second argument is taken from the mysteries signified in the cross itself. For, as Augustine says in epistle 120 chapter 26:

---

[4] Joan. III, 14 et 15; Galat. VI, 14.

[5] Col. II. 14.

"He who died because he willed it, also died when he willed it, nor did he choose the cross rather than another instrument of death without cause." What the cross signifies mystically is taught by Irenaeus book V; Gregory of Nyssa oration I on the resurrection; Augustine in epistles 119 and 120; Jerome and Theophylact in chapter III to the Ephesians, where they explain Paul's words about the cross: "That you may be able to comprehend with all the saints what is the breadth and length and height and depth." For breadth is called the transverse wood; height, the part of the wood where the title is above the transverse; length, the part of the wood from the transverse to the earth; depth, the part of the same which is hidden under the earth.

This figure signifies first the whole Christian perfection, as Augustine teaches: depth, Faith; height, Hope; breadth, Charity; length, Perseverance.

Second, the effect of Christ's passion, for the supreme wood signifies heaven opened by Christ's passion and God placated; the wood fixed under the earth, hell emptied and the Devil conquered; the transverse wood looking toward East and West, the whole world redeemed. Therefore let heavenly, earthly, and infernal things adore the crucified Christ, as Nyssen deduces.

Third, the two arms of the cross, under one title of the Savior, signify (says Irenaeus) the two peoples connected to each other under one head, Christ, according to that of John XII: "And I, when I am lifted up from the earth, will draw all things to myself." (6)

---

[6] Joan. XII, 32.

Minutius Felix in Octavius and Ambrose add that the figure of the cross is also naturally salutary. For birds would never fly unless with wings spread they imitated the form of the cross; and a ship would not move unless a cross were made from the mast and yard; and a plowman would not cut the earth unless he made a cross from the plow and handle; and again another from the yoke and pole. Heaven itself makes a cross if lines are drawn from East to West, from North to South.

Finally, even to the Egyptians who used hieroglyphic characters, the cross signified life to come, as Rufinus relates in book II History chapter 29.

The third argument, from the finding of the cross, from which multiple testimony is taken that the veneration of the wood of the cross pleases God.

First, that God did not permit that wood to be sunk in the sea or consumed by flames. For that the enemies of Christians attempted to abolish the cross and all its traces is clear from the fact that they hid the cross very deeply under the earth, and in the place of the cross they placed a statue of Venus; in the place of the resurrection, of Jupiter; in the place of the nativity, of Adonis, as Blessed Jerome relates in his epistle to Paulinus on the institution of the monk. Why, I ask, did they not burn the cross, when they wished to and could, unless because God took away their mind, so that for the consolation of the pious the most precious wood might be preserved?

Second, that God willed the cross to be found at that time when it could safely be worshipped, namely at the beginning of

Constantine's reign. For if it had been discovered earlier, while persecutors were reigning, it would have been received more for mockery than for honor. But if it had been found long after the times of Constantine, the holy cross would have been defrauded of due honor. Then therefore divine providence first manifested the cross when it could first be worshipped.

Third, because by evident miracles it was demonstrated to be the true cross, and therefore the finding of the cross was that revelation from God. For when three crosses had been found together, and the cross of the Lord could not clearly be distinguished from the crosses of the thieves, all three were brought to a certain woman who was in extremis, and when the first two had done nothing, the third applied to the woman immediately restored her to health. Rufinus writes this in book X History chapter 8; Socrates book I chapter 13; Theodoret book I chapter 18; Sozomen book II chapter 1; and Nicephorus book VIII chapter 29. Nor did it only heal the sick woman, but also raised a dead man at the same time, as Paulinus writes in epistle XI to Severus, Severus in book II of sacred history, and Sozomen book II chapter 1, who mentions both the dead man and the sick woman.

Nor does it matter that Ambrose in his oration on Theodosius and Chrysostom in homily 84 on John say that the cross of the Lord was recognized from the title, which the other two lacked. For Rufinus indicates that the cross of the Lord was indeed recognized from the title, but not entirely evidently, because the title was not affixed to the cross but lay near it; and therefore, so that no ambiguity would remain, they resorted to the miracle. Nor did only the

cross become famous by that miracle, but also the nail which Helena sent to Constantine. Concerning it indeed (as Ambrose testifies in the place cited) the Jews said: "Behold, even the nail is in honor, and what we impressed for death is a remedy of salvation, and by invisible power torments demons."

Fourth, because Helena was not incited of herself to seek the cross of the Lord, but was admonished by divine revelations. For thus Eusebius testifies in the Chronicle which Jerome made Latin: "Helena," he says, "the mother of Constantine, warned by divine visions, found at Jerusalem the most blessed wood of the cross on which the salvation of the world hung." And the same is said by Ambrose, Rufinus, Paulinus, Sulpicius, and others. From which appears the impudent blasphemy of the Magdeburg Centuriators, who in Century IV chapter 6 column 458 call Helena superstitious because she went to Jerusalem to find the wood of the cross, whom nevertheless all the holy Fathers wonderfully praise and say that she sought the wood of the cross by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. But the Magdeburg Centuriators attempt to render doubtful this very famous history in Century IV chapter 13 columns 1438 and 1439 by two conjectures. The first is that Ambrose is the most ancient of all who relate this history, but Erasmus does not accept his oration on Theodosius, where this is contained, as genuine. The second is that Eusebius in book III on the Life of Constantine narrates many things about Helena and about the purification of Mount Calvary, and yet does not mention the finding of the cross.

To the first I say first that no such censure of Erasmus exists; indeed, the Magdeburg Centuriators themselves in Century IV chapter 13 in the life of Ambrose, from Erasmus's judgment, attribute this oration to Ambrose. From which you can perceive their consistency.

I say second, if it existed, Erasmus is not a divine oracle to whom one must necessarily believe when he offers no reason. I say third, it is false that Ambrose is the most ancient of those who relate this history; for Sulpicius, Paulinus, Rufinus, Jerome, Chrysostom, who recite the same, can be called equals of Ambrose, since they lived at the same time, although Ambrose was perhaps a little older. Then Cyril of Jerusalem, older than Ambrose, recites the same in his epistle to Constantine Augustus. Likewise Constantine himself, similarly older than Ambrose, mentions it in his epistle to Macarius, which Eusebius relates in book III on the Life of Constantine, where he thus has it: "So great is the benignity of our God that no verbal services can be worthy of the present miracle. For this exceeds all admiration and stupor, the sign of the most sacred torment, buried in the earth for so many years, until, with the common enemy killed, it appeared to the free family," etc. There he adds that faith was declared by new miracles.

To the second objection we say that Eusebius mentions this matter in the Chronicle, but in the books on the Life of Constantine he did not make mention of this matter because the thing was most well-known to all, and he thought it was enough that he had touched on it in the letters of Constantine. To this finding of the holy cross can be added the finding of the sacred lance, which was

found by divine revelation at Antioch in the year of the Lord 1098 and ennobled by a distinguished miracle. See William of Tyre book VI on the sacred war, Paul Aemilius book IV on the deeds of the Franks, and Dodechinus, the continuator of Marianus Scotus, in the Chronicle of the year 1100.

The fourth argument, from the testimonies of the ancients, who everywhere relate with what desire the faithful were held to have, or at least to see, particles of the true cross, which no one is ignorant pertains to the great honor of the cross. First of all, Blessed Cyril of Jerusalem in catecheses 10 and 13 says that from the wood of the cross found at Jerusalem the whole world was filled, with very many seeking and obtaining particles from there. Constantine inserted a particle of the cross into his statue, which he placed at Constantinople, thinking that through that particle of the cross the whole city should be guarded, as Socrates relates in book I chapter 13 and Eutropius, or Paul the Deacon, who added much to Eutropius in book XI of Roman affairs. Gregory of Nyssa in the life of his sister Macrina writes that she was accustomed to wear around her neck a silver cross in which was inserted a particle of the true cross.

Paulinus in epistle 12 to Severus writes that he is sending, as the highest gift, a particle of the true cross enclosed in gold. The same also on the tenth birthday of St. Felix writes that he extinguished a very great fire by showing a particle of the cross, which could not be extinguished by any art.

"I myself," he says, "returning home, a small but great [fragment] of salvation, taken from a fragment of the eternal cross,

I bring forth and holding it in my hand I thrust it far against the opposing flames," etc.

Chrysostom in his homily "That Christ is God" writes that those who were able to obtain a particle of the cross, worthily believe that they preserve it enclosed in gold and are greatly adorned and guarded by it. Evagrius in book IV History chapter 26 and Procopius in book II on the Persian War narrate that at Apamea there was a particle of the holy cross, which the people wanted to be shown to them when the city, long besieged, seemed about to be captured, so that having seen the cross of the Lord, they might die more eagerly. But when that cross was shown by the Bishop once, and again, and a third time, it flashed forth once, and again, and a third time a splendid fire, not burning but shining, by which the enemies were terrified and lifted the siege. Gregory in book VII epistle 126 to Recared, King of the Visigoths, sends a particle of the cross as an excellent gift.

Ambrose in his oration on Theodosius, speaking of the nail inserted by Helena into the helmet of the Emperor: "Wisely," he says, "Helena acted, who raised the cross (namely a particle of the cross, namely one nail) on the head of kings, so that the cross of Christ might be adored in kings."

Jerome in Psalm XCVIII explains concerning the cross that verse: "Worship his footstool." And in epistle 17 to Marcella he says: "Will there not be that day when it will be permitted to us to enter the cave of the Savior, then to lick the wood of the cross," etc.

CHAPTER 27

Augustine in book XXII of the City of God chapter 8 writes that miracles were accustomed to be done by holy earth brought from the Holy Land, from Mount Calvary, to Africa, and that he with another bishop buried it and established a place of prayer over it. With what honor would Augustine have pursued the cross, when he thus honored the earth where the cross had been?

To these add the song of the Sibyl, which is found in book VI of Sibylline songs, near the end: "O happy wood, on which God himself hung."

The fifth argument, from the exaltation of the cross. For it is established from Paul the Deacon, Zonaras, and Cedrenus in the life of Heraclius, that Heraclius in the recovery of the cross, which the Persians had taken from Jerusalem, was divinely aided, so that even from heaven God fought with stones of hail against the Persians, as he had once done with Joshua. In the very restitution of the cross to its place, certain miracles also occurred, as Sigebert relates in his chronicle of the year 631. Whence also Otto of Freising testifies to the institution of the feast in book V chapter 9, and Bede and Ado in the martyrology.

The sixth argument: if the place where an angel stood is holy ground, Joshua chapter V, Exodus III, why not much more the cross where Christ stood? If the handkerchiefs and aprons of Paul were honored because of contact, why not much more the cross of Christ sprinkled with blood? If the sacraments are honored because they are instruments of grace, why not the cross, which is the instrument of redemption?

CHAPTER TWENTY-EIGHT
ON THE IMAGE OF THE CROSS

Now indeed concerning the image of the Cross we have first the testimony of Matthew XXIV: "Then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven" [1]; from which appearance that sign, that is, the cross, will be rendered venerable in a wonderful manner. For although Calvin, Musculus, and others whom Marloratus cites in his chain commentary on this passage deny that this refers to the cross, and wish the meaning of these words to be: "Then shall appear the sign of the Son of man," that is, then the Son of man shall appear so manifestly, as if by giving a sign he had turned all eyes upon himself: nevertheless all the ancient fathers unanimously interpret this as referring to the cross: thus Origen, Chrysostom, Jerome, Hilary, Theophylact, Euthymius, Bede on Matthew chapter XXIV; likewise Cyril in Catechesis 15 and Augustine in Sermon 130 on the season. The Church also sings in the feast of the invention: "This sign of the cross will be in heaven, when the Lord comes to judge."

---

[1] Matth. XXIV, 30.

The Sibyl also in book VI at the end: "O blessed wood, on which God himself hung... The earth cannot contain you, but you shall see the roofs of heaven, when the renewed face of God shall shine with fire."

And indeed Thomas Waldensis in tome III, title 20, chapter 138, says not altogether improbably that the very true wooden cross, which is now divided into many particles, will then be re-formed, and gathered together, and will appear in heaven. For this the Sibyl and Chrysostom in his sermon on the cross and the thief seem to assert; nor do the other Fathers contradict this.

Nor does that objection of the Church stand: "This sign of the cross will be in heaven." For even the true cross can be called the sign of the cross, that is, an instrument having the figure of the cross. But if this is not admitted, at least a bright image of the cross will appear in heaven from condensed air or fire, as Abulensis and Jansenius and others teach.

From this, however, a manifold argument is drawn to prove the honor of the cross. For first, the cross is honorable because it is called by Christ himself his sign, that is, the standard of Christ; for if soldiers adore the standard of the Emperor, as is evident from Sozomen book 1, History chapter 4, why should not the standard of Christ be adored? Second, it is honorable because it will appear in heaven, namely in a sublime and honorific place. Third, because it will be carried by the hands of Angels, as Augustine teaches in sermon 130. Fourth, because it will shine more brightly than the Sun: which Augustine and Chrysostom prove; because then it will

appear and be seen by all, when the Sun, and Moon, and stars will have been darkened, as is evident from Matthew chapter XXIV.

A second argument can be taken from the testimonies of sacred Councils. For the Sixth Synod canon 73, the Seventh Synod final act, and the Eighth Synod likewise final act published canons concerning the veneration of the cross.

The third argument from the usage and testimonies of the ancients. Justin in his Second Apology: "The signs and marks," he says, "which are among us declare the power of this thing (the cross)." Tertullian in his Apologeticus chapter 16 responds to the objection of the Gentiles concerning the adoration of the wooden cross; Minutius does the same in Octavius. From which it appears that from the very beginning of the Church, even before the invention of the true cross, Christians were accustomed to have and venerate the image of the cross. Origen in book VI on the epistle to the Romans says that the figure of the cross placed before the eyes, if attentively considered, is effective for repelling every temptation.

Constantine the Great fashioned the labarum in the form of a cross, as is evident from Eusebius book IX, chapter 9 of the History and from book I On the Life of Constantine. But since the labarum was adored, Constantine would never have placed the cross on the labarum if he had thought it was idolatry to venerate the cross. Indeed, Sozomen book 1, chapter 4 of the History writes that Constantine therefore changed the labarum into a cross so that soldiers would become accustomed to venerating the cross. You will say that even before the times of Constantine the labarum had the form of a cross, as Tertullian in Apologeticus chapter 16, Justin in

the Second Apology, and Minutius in Octavius testify. I respond that the labarum before the times of Constantine had a certain similarity to the cross, because it was a veil suspended on wood, but did not properly have the figure of a cross except in the time of Constantine. The same Constantine, as Eusebius relates in book I On the Life of Constantine, having defeated Maxentius at Rome, erected a cross in a most celebrated place with these words: "This saving sign." And again he ordered a cross to be placed in the right hand of his statue with these words: "By this one sign of true fortitude I have liberated your city," etc. He also provided by decree that henceforth no criminals should be affixed to crosses, so that the cross would no longer be a source of horror, but of love and veneration for all, as Sozomen writes in book I, chapter 8 and Augustine in sermon 18 on the words of the Lord. And conversely, on coins, which all love, he ordered the figure of the cross to be struck, as Sozomen relates in the same place.

Theodosius, imitating the piety of Constantine, prohibited the cross from being carved or painted on the ground, lest the sacred sign be trampled by feet: for this is contained in book I of the Code, title 8, law "Cum sit nobis." This testimony the adversaries corruptly cite from Peter Crinitus book IX, chapter 9, as if Theodosius had prohibited the image of the cross from being carved or painted.

Arcadius the son, following Theodosius, ordered golden money to be struck with the sign of the cross, as Prosper testifies in On Predictions and Promises part 3, chapter 34.

Tiberius also, that excellent Emperor, following the law of Theodosius, when he had seen a cross incised in marble on the ground in the palace, immediately ordered it to be erected, saying: "Should we fortify our forehead and breast with the Cross of the Lord, and we trample it with our feet?" Paul the Deacon testifies to this in book XVIII of Roman Affairs. Where he also adds that under that marble was found an immense treasure of more than one hundred thousand gold pieces, evidently as a reward for the piety of so religious a Prince.

In the time of Constantine, Lactantius wrote a poem on the cross, in which among other things we read: "Bend the knee, and adore the venerable wood of the cross."

Not long after, Athanasius in question 16 to Antiochus gave the reason why Christians make and venerate images of the cross rather than of the lance or sponge; because evidently if the pagans say we worship wood, immediately by separating the two pieces of wood of the cross we destroy the figure of the cross, and no longer venerate it.

John Chrysostom in supplications ordered silver crosses to be carried before with burning torches, as Socrates book VI, chapter 8 and Sozomen book VIII, chapter 8 testify. The same Chrysostom also in the book "That Christ is God" says that in his time the figure of the cross was accustomed to be painted in all places, in cities, in houses, in bedrooms, in vessels, in solitude, in mountains, etc. Augustine in tractate 36 on John and on Psalm XXXVI: "He who," he says, "attributed such honor to his punishment, what does he reserve for his faithful ones?" Cyril in book VI against Julian re-

sponds to Julian reproaching Christians for adoring the wood of the cross and painting its figure before their houses. Rufinus in book II, chapter 29 of the History testifies that in Egypt, when the Egyptians were converted to the faith, crosses were painted everywhere in place of the breast of Serapis, whom the pagans venerated. Bede in book 1 of the History of the English, chapter 25, writes that Augustine, sent by Blessed Gregory for the conversion of the English, carried before him a silver cross and an image of Christ painted on a tablet as a standard. Gregory himself also in book VII, epistle 3 speaks of the veneration of the cross. Leo in sermon 8 on the passion of the Lord: "With beautiful appearance," he says, "he bore the trophy of his triumph and the sign of salvation to be adored by all peoples, the mark of his most invincible patience."

Sedulius in the Paschal Poem: "He himself was the peace of the cross, and illustrating the violent strength with his own members, he clothed punishment with honor. And he made the torture rather a sign of salvation, and he himself sanctifying blessed the torments in himself: lest anyone be ignorant that the form of the cross is to be venerated, which bore the Lord triumphantly," etc.

The fourth argument from the appearance and miracles of the cross. First, there appeared to Constantine a most bright cross in the air with those words: ἐν τούτῳ νίκα (in this conquer), as Eusebius relates in book 1 On the Life of Constantine. Where he also adds that he received this from Constantine himself swearing that the matter was so. Nor did the cross appear to him in sleep, as Sozomen book 1, chapter 3 and Paul the Deacon book XI of Roman

Affairs say; but clearly to him while awake and making a journey with his whole army, as Eusebius says.

Moreover, that it was not said in vain to Constantine "In this sign conquer" appears from the victories of Constantine, for in book II On the Life of Constantine Eusebius writes that in battles Constantine always ordered the labarum marked with the cross to be carried to that part of the army which was laboring more; and wherever the labarum approached, victory was accustomed to follow immediately. He adds in the same place that he who carried the labarum, when out of fear of the enemies rushing upon him he had abandoned the labarum, was immediately killed; but he who took it from the hand of the one throwing it away could never be struck, even if innumerable missiles had been hurled at him; for all of them (wonderful to say) were fixed in the staff of the cross.

Second, a most bright cross appeared above the Mount of Olives in the time of Constantine the Emperor, concerning which appearance there exists a letter of Cyril of Jerusalem to Constantius.

Third, it appeared in the time of Julian the Apostate, who was already persecuting, as Gregory Nazianzen relates in oration 1 against Julian. For when Julian was inspecting the entrails of cattle for the sake of divination, he found a crowned cross; and certain skilled diviners, as Paul the Deacon relates in his life, said it signified that the Christian religion, which venerated the cross, would be perpetual and could not be conquered by Julian. But his flatterers said it signified the straits and as it were the prisons of the cross; but the outcome showed the former opinion to be true. At the

same time, when the Jews, at Julian's command, wished to rebuild the temple in Jerusalem in dishonor of the crucified one, there appeared again in the air a huge bright circle surrounding a most splendid cross; and moreover on the garments of almost all the men of that place crosses appeared as if elaborated with the highest skill, as the same Nazianzen writes in oration 2 against Julian.

Fourth, a cross appeared in the air in the time of Arcadius, when the Emperor undertook war for the faith against the Persians, persecutors of Christians, in which war he was divinely aided: Blessed Prosper testifies to this in the book On Divine Promises part III, chapter 34.

Fifth, crosses appeared on the garments of men in the time of Leo the Iconoclast, when heretics raged against sacred images, as Paul the Deacon testifies in the Life of Leo the Iconoclast. To this kind can be referred the appearance of the cross in England in a tree, in the year 1559, concerning which see Alan Cope.

Besides these appearances, innumerable miracles effected through the figure of the cross could be related. Notable is that one of Hilarion, which Blessed Jerome relates as having happened at Epidaurus. For when the sea was exceeding its boundaries, and there was danger lest it overwhelm the city, Hilarion painted three crosses on the shore. But the sea, when it had reached that point, began to swell and rose to a great height like a wall upward, as if raging and indignant that it was prohibited from proceeding further, finally yielding to the power of the cross, it turned its waves back upon itself. Bede also narrates many miracles done through a wooden cross in book III, chapter 2 of the History of the English,

erected by the holy King Oswald, and that first of all, that he himself with few men fought against innumerable enemies and conquered.

The final argument from reason. For the signs of holy things are holy and venerable, as we showed above; certainly any cross is holy and venerable, because it bears the image of Christ crucified, that is, of Christ occupied in the very work of redemption, than which nothing holier can be conceived.

CHAPTER TWENTY-NINE
ON THE SIGN OF THE CROSS

There remains the sign of the cross, which is painted on the forehead or in the air, or is expressed with the finger upon any things whatsoever. That this sign is sacred and venerable can first be shown from the figures of the Old Testament. For the blood of the lamb on the doorposts of houses, concerning which Exodus XII speaks, signified nothing other than the sign of the cross on the foreheads of Christians, as Augustine testifies in the book On Catechizing the Uninstructed chapter 20. Likewise that Tau, which Ezekiel chapter IX orders to be written on the foreheads of those who groan, most clearly indicated the sign of the cross, which we especially paint on the forehead, as Cyprian testifies in the book Against Demetrian, and Jerome in the commentary on Ezekiel. To these add that from Apocalypse XIV: "Having his name, and the name of his Father written on their foreheads"; that is, the sign of the cross. Likewise that from Apocalypse VII: "Hurt not the earth, neither the sea, nor the trees, till we have sealed the servants of our God in their foreheads" (1). For that this sign is the sign of the cross,

---

1 Apoc. XIV. 1; VII. 3.

Ecumenius, Bede, Anselm and Rupert teach in this place. Jacob also when he blessed the sons of Joseph with crossed hands, Genesis XLVIII, signified that there would be sometime a time when blessings would be made with the sign of the cross.

Second, it is proved from the testimonies of the ancients, who flourished in the first five hundred years. Dionysius chapters 4, 5, and 6 of the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy says that in all Sacraments the sign of the cross is employed. Justin in question 118 responds to the Gentiles asking why Christians prayed toward the East: and he says the cause is that better things should be given to God: "Just as also," he says, "we express the sign of the cross with the right hand rather than the left, when we bless someone." Hippolytus, a certain most ancient writer and familiar with the Apostles, whose book Palladius cites in the Lausiac History, chapter 148, writes that a certain virgin protected by the sign of the cross escaped unharmed from a brothel.

Tertullian speaks thus in the book On the Military Crown: "At every step forward and advancement, at every entrance and exit, at clothing, at putting on shoes, at baths, at tables, at lights, at bedrooms, at seats, whenever activity exercises us, we mark our forehead with the sign of the cross." He has the same in book II To His Wife, and in the beginning of the Scorpiace.

Cyprian in book IV, epistle 6 at the end: "Let the forehead be fortified, so that the sign of God may be preserved unharmed." And in the book On the Unity of the Church, beyond the middle, he says that Uzziah was struck with leprosy on the forehead, the Lord being offended, in which part of the body those are signed

who deserve the Lord. And in the book On the Lapsed, at the beginning: "A forehead pure with the sign of God could not bear the crown of the Devil, it reserved itself for the crown of the Lord."

Pope Cornelius in the epistle to Fabian, which is in Eusebius book VI of the History chapter 33, says that Novatian was seized by a demon because he had not received the seal of Christ on his forehead.

Origen in Exodus chapter XV, homily 6, says thus: "Fear and trembling fall upon them (demons) when they see the sign of the cross faithfully fixed in you," etc. That Gregory of Neocaesarea often used the sign of the cross against demons, Gregory of Nyssa testifies in his life. Lactantius in book IV, chapter 26 says that Christ benefits all those who have inscribed the sign of the cross on their forehead.

Cyril in catechesis 4: "Let us not," he says, "be ashamed of the cross of Christ. If anyone conceals it, do you manifestly sign yourself with the cross on your forehead." And below: "Make this sign, both eating and drinking, and sitting and standing, and speaking and walking, and in sum in every business." He repeats the same in catechesis 13. Athanasius in the book On the Incarnation of the Word: "By the sign of the cross," he says, "all magic is restrained," etc.

Basil in the book On the Holy Spirit, chapter 37, places among the primary Apostolic traditions the signing of oneself with the sign of the cross. Gregory Nazianzen in oration 1 against Julian says that even soldiers were accustomed to employ the sign of the cross at table. Chrysostom in homily 55 on Matthew chapter 12

teaches that all Sacraments are perfected by the sign of the cross. And in the homily "That Christ is God," he pursues very many things about the glory of this sign, and most eloquently.

Ephrem in the book On Penance chapter 3: "Let us paint," he says, "on doors and on our foreheads, and on the mouth, and on the breast, and on all members the life-giving sign. Let us arm ourselves with this invincible armor of Christians." Likewise in the book On Spiritual Armor, chapter 2: "Fortify yourself with the sign of the cross in place of a shield; for it is the strongest armor." Blessed Antony, as Athanasius relates in the Life of the same Antony, ordered monks to be safe against all terrors by the sign of the cross alone. Palladius in the Lausiac History, chapter 2, writes that a certain holy old man, when he had seen an asp in a well, fortified that well with the sign of the cross, and then without fear drew water and drank. Theodoret in the Religious History everywhere mentions the cross and its power.

Ambrose in sermon 43 exhorts that we begin all works from the sign of the cross. And in sermon 90 the words of Saint Agnes are recited saying: "He placed his sign on my face, so that I might admit no lover except him." For this is the sign of the cross, by which we are dedicated to God.

Jerome in the epistle to Demetrias: "Close the chamber of your heart, fortify your forehead with the frequent sign of the cross." Likewise to Eustochium: "At every step let your hand paint the cross of the Lord."

Augustine in Tractate 148 on John at the end: "What is it that all know, the sign of Christ, except the cross of Christ? Which

sign unless it is applied, whether to the foreheads of believers, or to the very water by which they are regenerated, or to the oil with which they are anointed with chrism, or to the sacrifice by which they are nourished, none of these things is rightly accomplished." Likewise in book 1 of the Confessions chapter II: "I was already signed with the sign of the cross, and was seasoned with the salt of Christ." Blessed Martin in Sulpicius: "I," he says, "protected by the sign of the cross, not by shield or helmet, will penetrate the wedges of enemies securely."

Prudentius in the hymn before sleep: "When sleep calls and you seek a chaste bed, let the figure of the cross sign your forehead and the place of your heart. The cross drives away all crime. Darkness flees from the cross. With such a sign dedicated, the mind knows not how to waver."

Paulinus in the eighth nativity of Saint Felix: "The sign of the invincible cross and confession protects us. And armed with God in mind, we seek not weapons of the body, and although we seem unarmed in our members, yet we bear arms, by which even under serene peace we fight in our souls against incorporeal enemies."

Third, it is proved from miracles done by the sign of the cross. Tertullian at the beginning of the Scorpiace says that Christians by signing or adjuring often benefit not only Christians, but also pagans. Lactantius in book IV chapter 27 says that in the presence of a Christian who had signed the cross on his forehead, the Devil did not dare to give responses to the Emperor seeking them. Epiphanius in heresy 30 writes that a certain Joseph, not yet a

Christian, expelled demons by the sign of the cross, and afterward having become a Christian destroyed the incantations of the Jews by the same sign. Nazianzen in oration I against Julian writes that Julian himself, although a pagan, when he saw certain specters while necromancers were performing their mysteries, fortified himself with the sign of the cross, and immediately all the specters vanished. Nyssen in the Life of Gregory the Wonderworker writes that his deacon, fortified with the sign of the cross, went out at night unharmed from baths among innumerable specters, from which baths none of those who had entered at night had ever come out alive.

Athanasius in the Life of Antony; Jerome in the Life of Paul the First Hermit; Theodoret in book V of the History chapter 21 and Gregory in book III of the Dialogues chapter 7 write many miracles which God performed at the sign of the cross alone, and especially in the expulsion of demons. Palladius in the Lausiac History, chapter 54, writes that someone fortified with the sign of the cross remained unharmed for a long time in the midst of flames. Theodoret in the Life of Saint Julian and in the Life of Saint Marcian writes that huge dragons were killed by both in their time by the sign of the cross. Likewise in the Life of Saint Aphraates, and Saint Macedonius, and Saint Peter, and others, he writes that they cured various diseases by the sign of the cross. Which same thing Sulpicius in the Life of Blessed Martin; Jerome in the Life of Hilarion; Augustine in book XXII On the City of God, chapter 8, similarly write. Victor of Utica in book II On the Persecution of the Vandals writes that a blind man was illuminated by Bishop Euge-

nius the Catholic by the sign of the cross alone. If we wished to add the miracles published after the first five hundred years, which are related by approved authors concerning Saint Benedict, Bernard, Francis, and others, we would never finish.

CHAPTER THIRTY
THE OBJECTIONS OF HERETICS ARE RESOLVED

From those things which have been said, it will be easy to resolve the objections of heretics noted above. To the first therefore, which was taken from the fact that the cross brought pain and ignominy to Christ, we respond that if the cross alone brought pain and ignominy to Christ, it would deservedly be execrable; but it also brought joy and glory, because of the Devil conquered and the human race redeemed; which joy and glory was so great that it completely absorbed that former pain and ignominy, as is evident.

To the second, which was taken from the similarity of those whose parents perished on gallows, who would seem impious if they honored such gallows, I say those are not similar. For those who are now suspended on gallows by the sentence of a judge are suspended by their own fault, either true or at least legitimately proved in judgment. Moreover, they are suspended unwillingly. Finally, from their very death they gain nothing except punishment and infamy. But Christ was not crucified for a true or proved fault. For it is established that the judge himself often testified that he

found no cause in him. Besides, Christ spontaneously delivered himself to the crucifiers, to fulfill the obedience of the Father, when otherwise he could escape if he wished, as is known; because when he said "I am he," all his enemies fell backward. Finally, Christ obtained very many good things from his very death, as we said, both for himself and for us. Nor do we see this only in Christ's death, but also in the deaths of others who are killed for God or country. For friends most willingly preserve the instruments of their passion as monuments of virtue.

To the third argument, that to honor the cross is as it were to rejoice in the death of Christ, just as his enemies did, I say we have nothing in common with the enemies of Christ; for when we rejoice in Christ's passion, we do not rejoice in that in which his enemies rejoiced, but in that in which he himself rejoiced, that is, in his triumph, not in his ignominy. Otherwise indeed we also know that we should compassionate Christ suffering, and honor his sorrows with pious tears.

To the fourth argument I say it does not follow that if we honor all crosses, we ought also to honor all mangers, all thorns, all lances, all rods, etc. For we adore all crosses because all are images of the true cross on which the Lord hung; and moreover also of Christ himself crucified. But mangers, thornbushes, lances, and similar things are not images of Christ, nor even of the manger, thorns, lance, and similar things which touched Christ. For similarity is not sufficient for an image, but it is required that one be expressed from another. Therefore a brother is not called the image of a brother, although they are similar, because one is not from the

other. But a son, because he is not only similar to his father, but also proceeds from him, is therefore truly called and is the image of his father. Now all crosses are made to express that first one, and thus are its images. But mangers, lances, and similar things are not made to express those, but for other uses, and therefore are not images. However, when a manger is painted or sculpted to represent the nativity of Christ, or a column to represent the flagellation, because then the manger and column are images, they do not lack their own veneration.

If you ask whence it is that we paint and adore the cross even without Christ crucified, and do not paint or adore the manger or column without Christ, I will respond for three reasons. First, because the cross even alone refers to Christ himself crucified; but those others do not do this. Second, because the cross has no other use than representing, especially after Constantine's edict about not crucifying men. But those other things have other uses; and therefore one who saw a column painted could not easily know what it signified, whether the column of Christ, or the column of Trajan, or Hadrian, or Hercules, or others. Third, because (as Athanasius says in question 16 to Antiochus) when we are accused of adoring wood, we can immediately show that we venerate the figure, not the matter, by separating those two pieces of wood from each other; which in a column, lance, sponge, and similar things could not be done so easily.

To the fifth, concerning honoring the lips of Judas and the hands of those who killed Christ, both because of contact with the sacred body and because they were instruments of the passion, I

respond that between the cross and the lips of Judas and the hands of Christ's crucifiers there is a great difference, as Thomas Waldensis teaches, tome III, title 13, chapter 120. For the Lord chose the cross and lovingly embraced it, as an innocent thing serving redemption. But the lips of Judas and the hands of the impious Christ did not choose or love, but execrated, as impious and wicked things. But we ought to love and honor only those things which the Lord loved and honored.

But the Wycliffites could respond that the lips of Judas and the cross are equal. For as the lips of Judas were the instrument of Judas's crime, and otherwise were not in themselves capable of guilt, so also the cross was the instrument of the crime of the Jews; and just as the Lord chose the cross, not as an instrument of crime, but as an instrument of passion, so also he chose the lips of Judas and the hands of the killers, not as instruments of crime, but as instruments of passion. Whence Augustine in Psalm XXXIV says that Judas was chosen by Christ so that through him he might fulfill our redemption.

I respond therefore that the difference consists in two things. First, because the lips of Judas and the hands of Christ's killers were not only instruments of passion, but also parts of those impious men, and therefore could not be honored as instruments of passion without at the same time the impious men themselves seeming to be honored. But the cross, thorns, column, and similar things are not parts of those men, but are things existing by themselves and innocent by their nature, etc.

Second, because in the passion of the Lord we can consider action and passion, of which the former was wicked, the latter most holy. Moreover, the lips of Judas and the hands of the impious were proximate and immediate instruments of the wicked action itself, but remote and mediate of the salutary passion. On the contrary, the cross, and nails, and similar things were proximate and immediate instruments of the holy passion, and remote and mediate of the wicked action, as is evident; and therefore the lips of Judas participate more in the action than in the passion, and the cross on the contrary more in the passion than in the action. Therefore the cross is simply venerable, the lips of Judas simply detestable.

To the last, concerning magic and superstition, I say that the sign of the cross is so far from magic that rather by that sign all magic is dissolved, as Saint Athanasius most correctly says in the book On the Incarnation of the Lord and His Salutary Advent: "By the sign of the cross," he says, "all magic is restrained, sorceries become ineffective." And below: "Let him come who wishes to take trial of these sayings, and in the very illusions of demons and impostures of oracles and in the miracles of magic let him use the sign of the cross, though derided by them, and invoke the name of Christ; and he will see how by fear of this the demons flee, oracles fall silent, magic and sorcery lie prostrate." These are his words. James Sprenger also writes in the Hammer of Witches, part II, question 1, chapter 2, that magicians and witches when they are initiated into the sacred rites of the demon, openly promise the Devil sitting as on a tribunal and before witnesses that they will

trample the cross of the Lord; because evidently where the cross is honored, no magical arts are effective.

It should be known therefore that it is superstitious and prohibited to use characters and figures for producing certain effects, as magicians do, because those effects cannot be natural, since characters and figures are not naturally operative. Nor do those effects come from God, since no such promise of God is found, nor is God invoked by them, but all those things are done by the demon, and characters serve only as a sign of covenant between the Devil and magicians. But the sign of the cross works wonders, not from its natural power which it has as a certain figure, nor as a sign of pact with the demon, but as a sign divinely instituted.

But so that this may be perceived more clearly, note that there are three marvelous effects of the cross. First, it terrifies and puts demons to flight. Second, it drives away diseases and all evils. Third, it sanctifies those things upon which it is impressed. Indeed, the first effect derives from three causes: from the apprehension of the demon, from the devotion of man, and from the institution of God. For when a demon sees the cross, it immediately recalls that it was conquered, despoiled, bound, and weakened by the cross of Christ. Hence it fears the cross and flees, just as a dog flees from the stone and stick with which it was beaten.

Next, the cross has power ex opere operantis (from the work of the worker) in the same way that prayer has power. For the sign of the cross is a certain invocation of the merits of the crucified Christ expressed by a sign. We speak indeed with heart, voice, and

gestures. Therefore, to oppose the sign of the cross against the Devil is to oppose the merit of Christ's passion, that is, to invoke God through the merits of Christ against the Devil. Whence the effect proceeds more from faith, confidence, and interior devotion than from the very character of the cross itself; just as when we pray with voice and obtain our request, the effect is attributed more to the power of faith and interior confidence than to the sound of the voice. And concerning these two modes there is no doubt.

I think, however, that even in a third way, that is, from the institution of God and ex opere operato (from the work performed), the sign of the cross is effective against the Devil. For we see that Jews and pagans, without any faith in Christ, intending only to do what Christians do, have put demons to flight by the sign of the cross, as is evident from Nazianzus in Oration I against Julian, Epiphanius in Heresy 30, and Gregory in Book III of the Dialogues, chapter 7, from which it appears that the demon was put to flight not by the devotion or faith of the operator, but by the very sign of the cross itself.

Therefore Saint Augustine in Book 83 of Questions, Question 79, says that it has been decreed by God that demons must yield to the cross as to the scepter of the supreme King, just as peoples yield to soldiers when they display the sign of the Emperor: "Nor is it surprising," he says, "that these signs are effective when employed by good Christians, since even when they are usurped by outsiders, who have not at all given their name to this military service, they are still effective on account of the honor of the most excellent Emperor. But when such powers do not yield to these

signs, God himself prevents it by hidden means, when he judges it just and useful. For in no way do any spirits dare to despise these signs. They tremble wherever they behold them."

You will say: therefore there will be more sacraments than seven. I respond that the sign of the cross is not a sacrament properly speaking, both because it does not confer justifying grace, and also because it does not have an infallible effect, as Augustine says, and as experience also testifies.

Regarding diseases and other evils, which cannot perceive the power of signs, we say they are driven away by the cross as by a sign of faith and confidence, or rather as by an invocation expressed by a sign. For Christ promised the faithful that he would give them whatever they asked with faith, and specifically in the last chapter of Mark he had said concerning diseases: "They shall take up serpents, they shall lay hands upon the sick and they shall recover, and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them."[1] The faithful therefore implore God's aid against diseases and other evils through the merit of Christ, and they do this with heart, mouth, and gestures. And because then the effect is not produced ex opere operato, in the manner of the sacraments, but ex opere operantis, therefore it does not follow infallibly.

Regarding blessings, nearly the same thing must be said. For when we bless men, houses, fields, and similar things, by that sign we commend those things which we bless to God through the merits of Christ; and similarly when we bless water, oil, branches, candles, etc., we commend these things to God, and we pray that

---

[1] Marc. XVI, 10.

he may will them to be salutary for us, and that through them as through instruments he may help us.

Finally, what we explicitly ask through prayers, the same we implicitly ask through the sign of the cross. Although it cannot and ought not to be denied that some sanctity also comes to things when they are signed with the cross—not indeed a sanctity which is some physical quality, but a sanctity consisting in relation, such as belongs to the cross, nails, garments, and other things which touched Christ or the Saints: and such as belongs to those who touch the relics of the Saints. For the Fathers constantly teach that those who touch relics are sanctified in some way: Basil on Psalm 115, Gregory of Nyssa in the Life of Saint Theodore, John Chrysostom in the Sermon on Saints Juventius and Maximus, and others. But if contact with relics sanctifies, why not also contact with the saving standard? Certainly Augustine in Book II On the Merits and Remission of Sins, chapter 26, asserts this: "Catechumens," he says, "according to their own certain mode are sanctified through the sign of Christ and the prayer of the laying on of hands: and what they receive, although it is not the body of Christ, is nevertheless holy." And these things concerning relics and images suffice for the brevity of our established work.

On the Relics and Images of Saints

In this fervent and incisive work, the great Counter-Reformation Cardinal and Doctor of the Church, St. Robert Bellarmine, turns his formidable intellect to the defense of Catholic tradition against Protestant iconoclasm. Book Two of his Controversy on the Church Triumphant stands as a powerful affirmation of the Church's age-old practice of venerating the relics and images of the saints.

With the precision of a trained Scholastic and the zeal of a shepherd defending his flock, Bellarmine confronts the charges of superstition and idolatry leveled by the Reformers. He exposes the falsehoods of the Centuriators of Magdeburg, vindicates the honor given to the saints' relics, and distinguishes with theological finesse between adoration and veneration. Drawing upon Scripture, the Church Fathers, conciliar decrees, and rigorous metaphysical distinctions, he systematically demonstrates that the reverence shown to holy images and remains flows from the very logic of the Incarnation.

Scholars, seminarians, and defenders of Catholic tradition will find here not only an erudite exposition of sacred doctrine, but also a spirited model of polemical clarity and pastoral concern. On the Veneration of Relics and Images is a luminous chapter in the Church's defense of the visible signs of invisible grace—the sacred reminders of the saints' enduring presence and the Church's heavenly glory.

Contained in this Volume:

Preface • Chapters 1-30

Claude Sonnet 4

Machine Translation